

In the Matter of:)
)
Regular Meeting)
)

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 20, 2011

Reported by:
Martha L. Nelson

APPEARANCES

MEMBERS

John Fisher, Chairperson

Devinder Singh, Secretary

Dwight Ku, AAA, Northern California

Jeff Knowles, League of California Cities

Michael Robinson, CSAC

Wayne Henley, CT

Hamid Bahadori, ACSC

John Keller, CHP

John Presleigh, County of Santa Cruz

ALSO PRESENT

Cyrus Abhar

Rick Marshall

Johnny Bhullar

Gerry Meis

Roberta McLaughlin, Caltrans

Bill Winter, Deputy Director, L.A. County Dept of Public Works

Ahmad Rastegarpour

Lindell Price

Jeff Thom, California Council of the Blind

Richard Haggstrom

Stephen Pyburn, Federal Highway Administration

Daniel Klinker, Department of Transportation

APPEARANCES (CONT.)

ALSO PRESENT (CONT.)

Harold Garfield, Consulting Traffic Engineer

Larry Patterson, City of San Mateo

Donald Howe, Caltrans

Rick Marshall, Napa County

Jacob Babico, County of San Bernardino

Anne Geraghty, Walk Sacramento

Stanley Price

John Poimeroo

Gordon Wong, Caltrans

INDEX

PAGE

Action Items:

1.	Membership	5
2.	Introduction	5
3.	Approval of Minutes (February 2, 2011 Meeting)	N/A
4.	Public Comments	14
5.	Public Hearing	
	11-3	16
	11-15	35
	11-16	86
	11-17	116
	11-18	121
	11-14	134
	11-1	218
6.	Request for Experimentation	
	11-19	209
7.	Information Items	
	11-20	209
8.	Tabled Items	
	11-5	N/A
9.	Next Meeting	298
10.	Adjourn	299

1 PROCEEDINGS BEGIN AT 9:16 A.M.

2 (The meeting was called to order at 9:16 a.m.)

3 RANCHO CORDOVA, CALIFORNIA, THURSDAY, OCTOBER 20, 2011

4 MEETING BEGINS AT 9:16 A.M.

5 CHAIR FISHER: Okay. Good morning. I'd like to
6 call the meeting to order of the October 20th, 2011 meeting of
7 the California Traffic Control Devices Committee. We are
8 gathered today in the beautiful City of Rancho Cordova, I
9 understand, a relatively new city, and we're very pleased to be
10 here today.

11 Before we have further discussion, though, I'd like
12 to go through the roll call of the committee. Introduce
13 yourselves, your affiliation, and then we'll have further
14 comments.

15 So we'll start on the left with Mr. Presleigh.

16 COMMITTEE MEMBER PRESLEIGH: Good morning. John
17 Presleigh. I'm with the County of Santa Cruz. Actually, this
18 is going to be my last meeting. I've been an alternate member
19 for a while, but following around Farhad. So Rick Marshall is
20 over there. He's going to be the new Northern California
21 representative as a member. So I don't remember who the
22 alternate was, but Rick is a very good guy to step into this
23 place. So thank you very much.

24 CHAIR FISHER: And, John, thank you for your service
25 to the committee. We're going to miss you. We're glad you're

1 able to participate today.

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER PRESLEIGH: Thank you.

3 CHAIR FISHER: And let us welcome Rick.

4 MR. MARSHALL: Thank you.

5 CHAIR FISHER: Welcome aboard.

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Good morning. I'm Hamid
7 Bahadori. I'm representing the Automobile Club of Southern
8 California, the south. I know why you came, because we had a
9 good meal last night.

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER PRESLEIGH: Very good dinner.

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: So he showed up only for
12 dinner.

13 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Jeff Knowles, traffic
14 engineer for the City of Vacaville, representing the League of
15 California Cities, northern section.

16 CHAIR FISHER: I'm John Fisher, assistant general
17 manger with the Los Angeles City Department of Transportation,
18 representing the League of California Cities in the southern
19 half of the state.

20 SECRETARY SINGH: I'm Devinder Singh, Caltrans,
21 Traffic Operations. I'm secretary for the committee.

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: I'm Wayne Henley and I'm
23 the Caltrans representative to the CTCDC.

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER KU: Good morning. My name is
25 Dwight Ku, and I'm from AAA, Northern California.

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER KELLER: Hello. I'm John Keller and
2 I'm representing the California Highway Patrol.

3 VICE CHAIR ROBINSON: I'm Mike Robinson, and I'm
4 representing the -- the Association of Counties.

5 CHAIR FISHER: Thank you all. And yesterday we had a
6 dinner to honor one of our outgoing longstanding members of the
7 committee, Farhad Mansourian. Farhad was with the County of
8 Marin. And unfortunately he couldn't make it to the dinner
9 last night because he had to go to a board meeting of his new
10 employer. And I guess they went in a closed session. And he
11 was hoping to come down and join us but he had to stay for
12 closed session. So we had quite a nice dinner that Devinder
13 Singh organized and held in his honor. And so we took photos
14 of us with our wine glasses, and we're going to send it to him
15 and show him what he missed.

16 But in the meantime we do have a plaque for Farhad.
17 I'll read it to you, a plaque prepared by those of us at the
18 CTCDC, and Devinder arranged it. It says,

19 "Presented to Farhad Monsourian October 20th, 2011 in
20 recognition of 22 years of dedicated and professional
21 service to road users in the State of California as a
22 representative of the California State Association of
23 Counties. Your commitment to traffic safety and
24 uniformity of traffic control devices has been an
25 inspiration to the profession. Your leadership in serving

1 as chairman of the CTCDC and your practical advice has
2 been invaluable in achieving reasonable and thoughtful
3 standards for uniform traffic control devices. Caltrans
4 and CTCDC members want to thank you for your outstanding
5 service."

6 Now Farhad was an alternate member from 1989 to 1999.
7 He was a full member from 1999 to 2011. He served as vice
8 chair between 2003 and 2006, and the chair between 2006 and
9 2008. And because of some recent turnover in the committee he
10 was also vice chair briefly during the year 2011.

11 So this is a plaque that we will make sure that we
12 get it to Mr. Monsourian and as kind of a personal gift, just
13 to give to Farhad, which shows the CTCDC logo and has his time
14 of service on the bottom and his name on top. And Devinder
15 assures me that he will get it to him.

16 And so we thank Farhad for 22 years of service, and
17 that's fairly rare for someone to be involved with the
18 committee for such a long time. And I know having worked with
19 Farhad he always gave a lot of thought to the deliberations of
20 the committee and always spoke his mind, and we really admired
21 him for that. So we wish Farhad Monsourian well.

22 At this point I'd like to recognize the City Engineer
23 and Public Works Director of the City of Rancho Cordova, Mr.
24 Cyrus Abhar. And why don't you just tell us a little bit about
25 your city.

1 MR. ABHAR: If I may --

2 CHAIR FISHER: You may want to turn it on.

3 MR. ABHAR: I think it's on. Is it?

4 CHAIR FISHER: Yeah.

5 MR. ABHAR: First of all, thank you for being here in
6 our -- our city. Members of the committee, welcome. My name
7 is Cyrus Abhar. I'm the Public Works Director and the City
8 Engineer, and also the Traffic Engineer for the City of Rancho
9 Cordova. And it's quite a pleasure and honor to have you all
10 in our city.

11 Just a little bit about our city. We are -- we are a
12 relatively young city. Until about three years ago we used to
13 call ourselves the newest city in California. But I understand
14 there have been two other incorporations not too long ago in
15 Southern California, so -- so we're no longer the youngest
16 city. But nevertheless, we incorporated on 5/1 of 2003, so
17 less than ten years old. And we're quite proud of the
18 accomplishments we've had in our eight years of cityhood.

19 I came to the city, I joined the city as a contract
20 employee and to help them to set up a public works and
21 engineering. And after about ten months or so I was asked to
22 join the city team and develop the Public Works Department.
23 And I've also been acting as the city engineer, traffic
24 engineer and facilities manager and the building official for
25 the city. So when you work for a small young city you end up

1 being the jack of all trades and other duties are assigned. So
2 any help, I'll be happy to -- to help you with -- with that.

3 We're also very excited to have you. We want to be a
4 hub. Because of our location in the region we'd like to be
5 hosting these kind of events. We want to be part of the larger
6 community, especially in my ward as far as my professional
7 community, and be able to make contributions.

8 So please take a look at our facility. If this
9 facility, if this specific room has any issues or problems
10 with -- for your future meetings, you also have the council
11 chambers that I can make available, or any other room. So
12 please let us know. And we would love to have you again. We
13 would love for you to come back in the future, so please let us
14 know how we can help to facilitate your meetings.

15 Just in the way of -- for those of you who have come
16 from out of town, there are -- if your meeting goes long enough
17 and you have to take a lunch break, which I understand
18 sometimes it can go quite long, if you continue within the
19 walking distance, if you go on Prospect Park and -- and cross
20 White Rock Road there's a pretty large, relatively new shopping
21 center with restaurants and places to eat. So that -- that
22 would be a good -- good place for -- if you need to take -- you
23 have to have a lunch break.

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Devinder had assured me
25 that the city was going to provide lunch.

1 MR. ABHAR: That can be arranged, too, if you
2 really -- truly, if you want to have a lunch meeting we'll be
3 happy to provide that.

4 CHAIR FISHER: Next time.

5 MR. ABHAR: But all -- all in all it's our pleasure
6 to have you here. And please let us know if we can help in
7 assisting any way.

8 CHAIR FISHER: Thank you, Cyrus. And thank you for
9 your hospitality today.

10 You know, one of the fringe benefits of being part of
11 the committee is that we get an opportunity to visit different
12 cities that we otherwise might not get to visit in Northern
13 California and Southern California. And I much confess, I
14 didn't know much about the City of Rancho Cordova, but I'm glad
15 I got to see what your city is all about. So great.

16 SECRETARY SINGH: And members of the audience
17 introduction.

18 CHAIR FISHER: Okay. We had identified a new member
19 of the committee, Rick Marshall.

20 Rick, why don't you just tell us a little bit about
21 yourself.

22 MR. MARSHALL: Sure. I'm a deputy director of public
23 works for the County of Napa. And one of my hats I wear is
24 being county traffic engineer. And I'll be joining the
25 committee to represent the Northern California Counties, CSAC.

1 So I came to Napa County about three-and-a-half years
2 ago after working for San Luis Obispo County for over 20 years.
3 And my first boss there is an old member of this committee
4 named John Mellow, if any of you know that name. He's to blame
5 for how I will behave. So it's a pleasure to be here. Thanks
6 for welcoming me.

7 CHAIR FISHER: Thank you, Rick.

8 And I'm told now we have now a new alternate from the
9 northern part of California for the Association of Counties,
10 and that is Robert Bronkall, Assistant Engineer, and he's from
11 Humboldt County. So we look forward to his participation on
12 this committee as an alternate member in the future.

13 And then finally I'd like to, if it's okay with you,
14 Wayne, I'd like to recognize some of the key members of your
15 staff, the Caltrans staff, which have helped to work on the
16 upcoming, it's either going to be December 2011 or January
17 2012, California MUTCD, who have assisted Johnny Bhullar. No
18 person could do it by himself. It takes a team effort. And I
19 believe we have today to join Johnny, Don Howe. Would you
20 stand as I mention your name, Don? And then Roberta
21 McLaughlin. Jennifer Perry. And Gordon Wong. So thank you
22 for joining us today.

23 And I must -- yes, Johnny?

24 MR. BHULLAR: (Off mike.) Ahmad.

25 CHAIR FISHER: Oh, yeah. Ahmad Rastegarpour. Thank

1 you, Ahmad.

2 MR. BHULLAR: He's in our traffic signal guy. And he
3 worked on national committee on signals.

4 CHAIR FISHER: Yes. Thank you for that.

5 And I also should recognize another special person in
6 the audience today, Gerry Meis, who used to be a member of this
7 committee at Wayne's spot until about, what, four years ago was
8 it?

9 MR. MEIS: Yes. Yes.

10 CHAIR FISHER: Okay. And Gerry lives nearby. And
11 we're glad he was able to join us today. And we're also glad
12 that he was able to have dinner with us last night. So --

13 MR. MEIS: I enjoyed meeting with everyone again.

14 CHAIR FISHER: Good to see you again, Gerry.

15 MR. MEIS: Thank you.

16 CHAIR FISHER: Okay. We'd like to now let people
17 from the audience introduce themselves. So why don't we start
18 with Cyrus, and go on this side, and then go on that side.

19 (Off mike introductions by the audience are made.)

20 CHAIR FISHER: Okay. Thank you all for that. Thank
21 you all. Okay.

22 (Off mike colloquy between committee members.)

23 CHAIR FISHER: I'm sorry. We didn't get our FHWA
24 representing.

25 MR. PYBURN: Steve Pyburn, Federal Highway

1 Administration.

2 CHAIR FISHER: Okay. So I think we've introduced
3 everyone. Okay.

4 At this time we'll go to public comments. Members of
5 the public may comment on any item not appearing on the agenda.
6 If there is an item appearing on the agenda wait until that
7 item comes up and we will make public comment at that time.
8 Matters presented under this item can not be discussed or acted
9 upon by the committee. For items appearing on the agenda the
10 public is invited to make comments at the time that the item is
11 considered by the committee.

12 Any person addressing the committee will be limited
13 to a maximum of five minutes so that all interested parties
14 have an opportunity to speak. When addressing the committee,
15 whether it's now or later on when an agenda item comes up,
16 please state your name, address and business or organization
17 that you represent so that we can have it for the record.

18 So are there any public comments on items not
19 appearing on the agenda? If so please go to the podium. Okay.
20 Seeing none, we will get into our regular portion of the
21 business meeting.

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Mr. Chairman?

23 CHAIR FISHER: Hamid?

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Mr. Chairman, before we
25 get to the agenda, as we discussed, Mr. Mansourian was serving

1 as the vice chair. Do you think it's appropriate to appoint a
2 new vice chair until we have our formal election in our first
3 meeting in 2012?

4 If that's the pleasure of the committee I would like
5 to nominate Mr. Robinson as the vice chair representing the
6 counties.

7 CHAIR FISHER: Yes. Thank you for bringing that to
8 our attention. We are without a vice chair at this point in
9 time. And we just had a motion to appoint Mike Robinson as a
10 vice chair for the remainder of this calendar year, as I
11 understand it. Do we have a second?

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: I'll second it.

13 CHAIR FISHER: Okay. Any discussion? Hearing
14 none -- yes, Roberta?

15 MS. MCCLAUGHLIN: It's a little difficult -- I am
16 having difficulty hearing. I know our reporter has got
17 microphones in the front, but it's not amplified. So just keep
18 in mind to talk very loudly so that the audience can hear, as
19 well.

20 CHAIR FISHER: Okay. Thanks for the reminder.
21 Everyone speak up.

22 We have -- we've moved, we've seconded to make Mr.
23 Michael Robinson the vice chair of the committee for the
24 remainder of this calendar year. Any further discussion on the
25 matter? All those in favor say aye?

1 ALL MEMBERS: Aye.

2 CHAIR FISHER: Opposed? Abstentions? Unanimous.

3 Congratulations, Michael.

4 VICE CHAIR ROBINSON: Thank you. I don't mind saying
5 this, because this is my second meeting this is quite an
6 intimidating action that you just took. But I'll do my
7 darndest to make sure that -- that the high standards of the
8 committee are met.

9 CHAIR FISHER: Great. And we're certain you'll live
10 up to the expectations.

11 Just as kind of a matter so that we can gage
12 ourselves here in the meeting, because of some flight
13 arrangements we would have a goal of completing our meeting
14 today at 2:30. Should it look like it -- that will not be
15 possible, you know, we have an extended discussion on an item
16 or two or three and that does not appear to be feasible then
17 we'll have to break and some of us will have to make new flight
18 arrangements. But kind of keep that in mind as a goal and
19 we'll see how quickly we're able to go. Okay.

20 We begin our agenda items. And we're on agenda item
21 number five where we have -- we will have a public hearing on
22 the next seven matters. And the first matter is item 11-3.
23 Now under all these seven matters Caltrans is required to have
24 a public hearing on these to hear from local agencies before
25 they consider adoption of any of these matters, and that's

1 required pursuant to Section 21400 of the California Vehicle
2 Code.

3 Item number 11-3 is one that I initiated, so I will
4 present it. It's one that was brought to the attention of the
5 committee at the last meeting. There were some comments on it
6 so we decided to bring it back to incorporate those comments.
7 And it was the item of the no parking sign of vehicles for
8 sale.

9 As we discussed at the last meeting, the California
10 Vehicle Code Section 22651.9 was added which allows a vehicle
11 to be impounded when it is advertised for sale, and under
12 specified conditions as shown in the California Vehicle Code.
13 We included a copy of the vehicle code here for reference on
14 page seven.

15 We developed a proposed sign. -- it's modified from
16 what was presented at the last meeting -- which shows the tow-
17 away symbol, the no parking symbol, and under it says "Vehicles
18 for Sale." We also indicate that the appropriate county code
19 or municipal code should be shown below it. And that the
20 number for recovering your impounded vehicle should also be
21 shown below it.

22 But then there were some questions regarding the
23 format. Should the format show the tow-away words or the tow-
24 away symbol? Should it show the no parking symbol or the words
25 no parking? So we wanted to broaden the -- the ways that we

1 could show it. So let me walk you through some of the language
2 that we've added -- that we're proposing to add in the
3 California MUTCD, the first of which appears on page 12 of 68
4 and it's show in green language, and it refers to this sign.
5 And it says, "The symbol tow-away, no stopping," -- let me see.
6 No that's not it. That's not it.

7 Let's go to page 13. This is the language which
8 would allow us to use that sign. It says,

9 "Support: Local agencies may adopt, by resolution or
10 ordinance, the restriction of parking and the impounding
11 of vehicles for sale, subject to the requirements of CVC
12 Section 22651.9. Under these requirements, a vehicle may
13 be impounded if a vehicle violation was received within
14 the last 30 days and a warning was issued.

15 "Option: The No Parking of Vehicle For Sale signs may be
16 posted to inform motorists that the parking of vehicles
17 for sale is prohibited and that vehicles may be impounded,
18 as prescribed in section -- CVC Section 22651.9,

19 "Guidance: If used, the applicable municipal code or
20 county code should be shown on the signs to assist
21 enforcement personnel in identifying the appropriate
22 parking infraction, due to the special requirements
23 prescribed in CVC Section 22651.9."

24 Now let's go to page 15 and look at the red language
25 there.

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Mr. Chairman, as you're
2 going forward do you want to discuss each of these --

3 CHAIR FISHER: Okay.

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: -- changes, or do you
5 want to go through your suggestions and then come back?

6 CHAIR FISHER: Let me -- I'm almost done. Let me
7 just go through the other two pages, and then let's go back to
8 discussion of it.

9 Let me direct your attention to page 15, the red
10 language. It says -- in G it shows how the information should
11 be presented on a sign and in what order, and it adds,
12 "The appropriate municipal or county code on selected signs
13 when deemed necessary in order to aid enforcement
14 personnel in identification the appropriate infraction."

15 And then one more addition, on page 16, there was the
16 question of can you interchange or do you show the symbol or do
17 you show the message? This would allow you to show either. We
18 would add the words, just to clarify it once and for all,

19 "On any sign, the words 'Tow-Away' may be used
20 interchangeably with the Tow-Away symbol." And then, "On
21 any sign, the words NO PARKING" may be used
22 interchangeably with the No Parking symbol."

23 And this would allow jurisdictions to show symbols if
24 that's what the elect to use, and, again, these are already
25 adopted symbols in the parking section of the California MUTCD,

1 or they could show word messages. In other words, it would
2 give jurisdictions the choice of -- of what -- of which format
3 they would like to use.

4 So with that we should open it up now to discussion
5 among committee members.

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Mr. Chairman, we had this
7 discussion. And by the way, thank you for changing the
8 signing, adding the word "of", because that makes it a lot more
9 clear that it is of vehicles for sale. That makes the -- the
10 intent of the sign very clear to the driver.

11 The vehicle code in this area does not preempt local
12 authority. So a local jurisdiction can still have any kind of
13 towing program that they want for vehicles for sale. The
14 vehicle code simply provides a blanket authorization that -- if
15 any agency wants to use. So that's -- that -- that was
16 something that I'm still struggling with them. Just because if
17 a jurisdiction wants to use the -- the CVC 22651.9 without
18 having their own local municipal ordinance or county ordinance
19 then they need to say that under the sign. They need just to
20 refer to CVC. So we need to give them that option, a well.

21 And all the provisions that the vehicle code is
22 asking for 22651.9, I think they're included, like, for
23 example, in the L.A. ordinance. But since we are in Rancho
24 Cordova, if City of Rancho Cordova decided that they want to
25 two vehicles that display signs for sale without any notice, on

1 the first violation they are perfectly authorized to do that
2 under state law. Nothing stops them. But if they want to use
3 the CVC code to tow the vehicles then they have to comply with
4 the regular requirement and 24-hour requirement. But that's a
5 technicality issue for the enforcement, whether they want to
6 use the state blanket authorization or if they want to have
7 their own local ordinances which can be more restrictive.

8 But I think if you are approving this it's good if we
9 also give the option or at least mention it somewhere, either
10 in a form of a second sign or make a note, a footnote on the
11 sign sheet that if they are applying the CVC code, then instead
12 of the municipal ordinance at the bottom it needs to say CVC
13 section.

14 And again, you know, the state law, the CVC does not
15 even require posting. You can enforce without posting. But if
16 you want to reinforce in areas of the city or county where you
17 have problems then you go and post the signs.

18 My thoughts for your consideration.

19 CHAIR FISHER: Right. And -- and that's why we
20 specifically, in the option on page 13, tried to word it to say
21 that the sign may be posted to inform motorists, rather than
22 saying it shall be posted or --

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Yeah.

24 CHAIR FISHER: -- should be posted, just because
25 there -- there's little ambiguities in the law.

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Yeah. And some locals
2 may not want to process a municipal ordinance for community
3 reasons, and they may just want to default back on the state
4 law. So they don't even need to refer to any municipal
5 ordinance, they just say CVC section blah blah on the sign.
6 That's the legal authority to do that. But then they have to
7 comply with the 30-day and 24-hour requirement.

8 CHAIR FISHER: Right. So the sign, I guess the way
9 we've written it up, would be optional, discretionary,
10 depending on consultation with the local legal council on --

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Yeah.

12 CHAIR FISHER: -- what should be required. And I
13 know among the jurisdictions in California there are various
14 views as to whether you need to post or not post signs. I
15 believe Long Beach does not post. The City of L.A. is posting.
16 And I believe the County of L.A. is starting to post.

17 MR. WINTER: And I'd like to say something, too --

18 CHAIR FISHER: Okay.

19 MR. WINTER: -- if I may.

20 CHAIR FISHER: All right.

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Typically, Mr. Chairman,
22 again, you know, for the consistency in the California Vehicle
23 Code, whatever section of the code that needs posting, the code
24 specifies that, that you can not enforce that section of the
25 law without posting. This section does not say you must post.

1 But obviously it's a good practice to post if you're planning
2 to tow vehicles. The whole idea is to detour people for
3 parking in areas and using public streets as car lots and cause
4 community and neighborhood problems. So posting is actually a
5 good deterrent, but it's not absolutely required.

6 CHAIR FISHER: Okay. Any other comments from
7 committee members?

8 VICE CHAIR ROBINSON: Mr. Chairman?

9 CHAIR FISHER: Yes, Mike.

10 VICE CHAIR ROBINSON: The County of San Diego also
11 will be posting along the same line. We think it's best to
12 inform so far as possible when a restriction of this nature is
13 necessary. I'd also like to point out that the -- and I know
14 we discussed a few other things at our last meeting regarding
15 the sign. But we are kind of as an option allowing, when
16 applicable, the -- the local ordinance to be identified on the
17 sign at the bottom.

18 I wonder if it would be appropriate to indicate if
19 this is not -- if this is not to be shown then the vehicle code
20 section should be posted, the idea being we would be assisting
21 our enforcement folks in identification of the appropriate
22 violation for the citation as they -- as they go. I think the
23 way it's currently identified we're allowing for the posting of
24 the -- the local ordinance, but we're not specifying otherwise
25 the vehicle code section should be identified.

1 CHAIR FISHER: In your jurisdiction are you adopting
2 a county code or county ordinance for this?

3 VICE CHAIR ROBINSON: Yes.

4 CHAIR FISHER: And if you are going to post signs
5 would you then be --

6 VICE CHAIR ROBINSON: We'll -- we'll be identifying
7 the county ordinance.

8 CHAIR FISHER: Okay.

9 VICE CHAIR ROBINSON: But -- but other jurisdictions
10 may not.

11 CHAIR FISHER: Uh-huh.

12 VICE CHAIR ROBINSON: And they can still enforce
13 based on the -- the vehicle code.

14 CHAIR FISHER: Okay.

15 VICE CHAIR ROBINSON: And I don't think we're
16 identifying that the vehicle code should be posted in the
17 absence of a local ordinance.

18 CHAIR FISHER: Okay. Any other comments from
19 committee members?

20 Seeing none we'll go to public comments.

21 MR. WINTER: Good morning. My name is Bill Winter,
22 Deputy Director with Los Angeles County Department of Public
23 Works.

24 As was mentioned by the chairman, this item was
25 discussed at the July meeting. I was one of the speakers on it

1 at that time. And I just simply wanted to express my support
2 for the item before you today. We did work at the -- at Los
3 Angeles County I worked with Mr. Fisher in coming up largely
4 with the language you see in the -- the item here.

5 As was mentioned, we have consulted with out legal
6 counsel. And I guess that would be the encouragement I would
7 want to give to any agency that would move forward with this
8 type of restriction is to closely consult with their either
9 city attorney or -- or county counsel. We did craft an
10 ordinance and we do intend on the sign the county uses to note
11 the -- the county ordinance. And our sheriff's department has
12 been very involved in coming up with the -- the proper
13 citation, and on the back of the citation to note, you know,
14 the kind of warning. Because the implication being if there's
15 a second infraction that that becomes the trigger for the tow-
16 away. And that was a little problematic because it's not an
17 immediate tow-away here, but it's on additional infractions.

18 So again, simply supporting the item. Thank you.

19 CHAIR FISHER: Any other members in the audience wish
20 to speak to this matter? Okay.

21 We have the language that's been proposed.

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Mr. Chairman?

23 CHAIR FISHER: Yes, Hamid.

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: The suggestion that I --
25 that I -- that I brought up, if you want to consider, I'm just

1 making the suggestion for the consideration by the committee.
2 I'm not necessarily married to the idea. But on page 13 under
3 option, the first paragraph where you're saying,
4 "No Parking of Vehicles For Sale signs may be posted to
5 inform motorists that parking of vehicles is prohibited
6 and that vehicles may be impounded as prescribed in CVC
7 Section 22651.9," we can say comma or as authorized by
8 local ordinance, so that whichever they use they know that
9 they can make reference to either CVC or their own local
10 ordinance.
11 CHAIR FISHER: Let me clarify that. When the local
12 ordinance so has to be consistent with the CVC section.
13 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: That was exactly what I'm
14 saying, that the state law is not preempting on this, at least
15 that's what I've been told by the attorneys who interpret these
16 things, that this is a local matter. And if the local agency
17 decides that they want to change the 30 hours to 7 days -- 30
18 days to 7 days and they want to get rid of 24 hours, there's
19 nothing in the state law that stops them. It just gives them
20 the authority to do that without passing a local ordinance.
21 But if you want to do the state, if you want to tow vehicles
22 for sale by the state authority then you have to comply with
23 the CVC section. But locals can have more a restrictive form
24 of local ordinances for towing if they want. I haven't seen
25 anyone, but they can completely get rid of the 30-day

1 requirement or reduce it to 15, 7 days. They can get rid of
2 the 24-hour requirement in their own local ordinances.

3 I'm just saying that since we have like 57 counties
4 and 400-and-some cities we can't possibly anticipate what all
5 the cities and counties are going to be doing in this area. So
6 you may want to give them a way not to come back here and say
7 that your sign says such and such. So it's -- you either refer
8 to CVC or your local ordinance. And if you add that comma --
9 comma after paragraph one it may solve that problem.

10 CHAIR FISHER: I just want to make sure I totally
11 understand and appreciate what you're saying.

12 The sign was designed to -- to reflect CVC Section
13 22651.9.

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: That's not what the sign
15 says.

16 CHAIR FISHER: But does -- that section does say that
17 within the last 30 days the vehicle will have had to have been
18 previously issued a notice of --

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Yeah. Yeah.

20 CHAIR FISHER: -- a parking violation.

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: But that's -- that's --
22 the sign on page eight, that's not what it says. The sign on
23 page eight says that your car is going to be towed in
24 compliance or in accordance with the L.A. -- to the L.A.
25 municipal code. It doesn't refer to California Vehicle Code.

1 Your municipal code just happens to be verbatim of the
2 California vehicle code. So what I'm saying is that some other
3 agencies may change that part of the vehicle code to fit their
4 own local needs. So the sign can say either municipal code of
5 vehicle code.

6 CHAIR FISHER: So in the option you would add which
7 words?

8 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: I would just -- at the
9 end I would say as prescribed in CVC Section 33651.9, or an
10 authorizing local ordinance. And then leave it up to them. If
11 they want to just copy the CVC section as your city has done
12 and maybe L.A. County has done, and San Diego may be doing the
13 same, fine, but some city or county may not want to go verbatim
14 CVC on this issue.

15 CHAIR FISHER: Okay. I'll take that under
16 advisement.

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER PRESLEIGH: Mr. Chairman, I would
18 ask that Mr. Winters, if you're going to develop your own
19 ordinance could you post it on your website and make it
20 available to other counties and agencies?

21 MR. WINTER: We have an ordinance. The board of
22 supervisors, I believe it was about four or five months ago,
23 adopted the ordinance. So it is now part of county code.
24 We've held off -- we've held off putting up the signs until
25 this matter had been resolved here. But I'd be glad to -- to

1 send that to any of the committee members if you want to see
2 how our county counsel crafted the ordinance. I believe it
3 even references right in the ordinance itself, it cross-
4 references 22651.9. So it is very clear that they're tied
5 together verbatim.

6 The reason we had the ordinance was certain findings
7 were also being made by our board that -- that gave the -- the
8 rationale for why the ordinance was necessary. And so that's
9 again why I would strongly consider any agency that does this
10 to consult with your legal counsel to make sure you have a
11 basis for moving forward with what arguably is a quality of
12 life type -- type of issue, not so much a traffic safety issue.

13 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Mr. Chairman, can I ask
14 Mr. Winter a question.

15 Mr. Winter, L.A. County, in absence of their local
16 ordinance, could still do this just using California Vehicle
17 Code?

18 MR. WINTER: I would say no. We -- we don't have the
19 authority to -- to -- to impound a vehicle just because it's
20 posted as a car for sale. The problem really had also been
21 that the -- you know, there had been the case, I guess it was
22 ACLU brought the matter up as a limitation of free speech. And
23 so that's another reason why the -- the state law really needed
24 to be created. And the state law itself is only about a year,
25 year-and-a-half old now.

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Yeah. But -- but one
2 more question is that now that we have state law why does every
3 county and city need to have their own ordinances that verbatim
4 repeats what the state law says?

5 MR. WINTER: Because the findings being made as to
6 why you've selected a certain area to create this type of a
7 zone, there was much discussion among our board of supervisors
8 that simply creating one zone, you're simply going to move the
9 problem down to the next block and the next block and the next
10 block. So we -- we made clear findings there about corridors
11 where this problem had been observed, where there had been a
12 concentration of this activity occurring.

13 It was clear from our -- our consultation with the
14 Department of Motor Vehicles that these are largely criminal
15 enterprise where we have targeted this type of signage. So we
16 wanted to make -- make it very clear what issue we were trying
17 to deal with, while at the same time allowing individuals who
18 may want to sell their own personal car to do so outside of
19 those areas. So we didn't want to create necessarily a blanket
20 zone. We wanted to really focus on where are the -- the
21 problem areas.

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Okay. So you think -- is
23 it your -- I guess your or the L.A. County legal opinion that
24 the city and the county can not enforce this section of the
25 vehicle code without having a local ordinance?

1 MR. WINTER: That's our county counsel's opinion,
2 yes. You need --

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Okay.

4 MR. WINTER: You need a local ordinance for this --
5 for this type of enforcement and for this type of restriction.
6 Now there is -- there is one exception to that, and I believe
7 it's in the sign chart. I think it's Sign SR-26.

8 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Okay.

9 MR. WINTER: It's a regulatory sign. But I believe
10 if you read in the California MUTCD about that sign it's cross-
11 referencing this provision in the vehicle code that only
12 applies to state highways.

13 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Okay. Then in that case
14 that's a very different hearing from William, at least, or a
15 legal opinion from what I have been told. And in that case
16 then even I'm more concerned about this section. Because the
17 way that it's written now it says that you can refer back to
18 CVC as prescribed in CVC. But you even have to change it and
19 say that, no, which I -- I disagree with -- with the legal
20 opinion on that one that you've been given. But based on my --
21 not my, but legal opinion that I've been given that if -- if
22 that's the case then MUTCD has to be very clear that only
23 cities and counties can post these signs that have passed their
24 own local ordinances.

25 CHAIR FISHER: Well, that's what 22651.9 says.

1 MR. WINTER: Yeah. It --

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: No. 22651.9 says it
3 allows you to do it even without an ordinance.

4 CHAIR FISHER: No. No. Item number four on page
5 seven, it says,

6 "The local authority of the city, county, or city and
7 county has, by resolution or ordinance, authorized the
8 removal of vehicles pursuant to this section from the
9 street or public lands on which the vehicle is located."

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: And the resolution is
11 that most of the cities, the smaller cities, they automatically
12 and blanket delegate that to the city traffic engineer. It
13 doesn't even go to city council, posting of parking signs.

14 CHAIR FISHER: Well --

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: I don't want to belabor
16 the point, but --

17 CHAIR FISHER: The city can, by ordinance, delegate
18 certain responsibilities to the traffic engineer. They can
19 decide on restrictions, no right turns --

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Yeah. No. I can --

21 CHAIR FISHER: -- traffic signals and the like. But
22 it's -- there still has to be an ordinance where they delegate
23 that.

24 In this case it's possible that they could delegate
25 it to the city traffic engineer, but there still has to be

1 either a resolution or an ordinance that adopts the right to
2 restrict the parking of vehicles for sale.

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: If that's your
4 understanding then I would like to suggest that we make it even
5 further clear in option one to say "as prescribed in CVC
6 Section 22651.9, as enacted or as authorized by local
7 ordinance."

8 CHAIR FISHER: Okay. Ordinance or resolution.

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Ordinance or resolution.

10 CHAIR FISHER: Correct.

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Because otherwise we're
12 going to get these signs and decided them and practiced and
13 posted 50 different ways all over California.

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER PRESLEIGH: Mr. Chairman, that's --
15 that's why I was interested. I think our board of supervisors
16 would feel the same. They would have some findings and
17 identify where the areas of concern were and identify that in
18 the ordinance and allow us to maybe post it. That -- that --
19 that was my concern about this. And we would still be
20 consistent with the CVC code. But there would be, in
21 particular, various findings to allow us to do this. And I
22 think they would want to present those findings at that level.

23 CHAIR FISHER: Okay. Thank you. Any other public
24 comments? Don.

25 MR. HOWE: Hello. I'm Donald Howe. I'm the science

1 chief at Caltrans. I just wanted to share a point of technical
2 usage. Under support we try to avoid using the verbs shall,
3 should or may, because those are pertinent to standards,
4 guidance and options. And so on page 13 of 68 you'll notice
5 under the support "may" is used twice. And perhaps we could
6 insert the word "can" so it would not use "may."

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: The second "may"; right?

8 MR. HOWE: So it would read, "Local agencies can
9 adopt." And then on the third line, "Under these requirements
10 a vehicle can be impounded."

11 CHAIR FISHER: Interesting point. What if we said
12 "are allowed"?

13 MR. HOWE: That's fine, just as long as we're not
14 using shall, should or may.

15 CHAIR FISHER: Okay. Thank you for catching that.

16 MR. HOWE: Okay. Any other comments from members of
17 the public? Okay.

18 Bring it back to the committee. Having heard the
19 discussion I'd like to make some technical adjustments to the
20 language in red that I've presented to you, and those
21 adjustments would be on page 13.

22 On page 13 under the support statement where we see
23 the word "may", we'll change that to "are allowed" -- or, I'm
24 sorry, "Local agencies are allowed." And then further down, "A
25 vehicle" -- let me see. And then under "A vehicle," instead of

1 "may be impounded" we'll say "can be impounded." That would be
2 the first amendment.

3 The second amendment would be in the option. And at
4 the end of the option statement where it says, "As prescribed
5 in CVC Section 22651.9" we would add a comma and add the words
6 "as authorized by a local ordinance or resolution."

7 So those would be the extent of the changes to the
8 original proposal. I -- with those changes I move approval of
9 the item before us.

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: I second that.

11 CHAIR FISHER: Any further discussion of the motion?
12 Okay. We'll go to a vote then. All in favor, raise your hand.
13 Okay. It carries unanimously. Thank you for that.

14 SECRETARY SINGH: Who moved the motion? Who moved
15 the motion?

16 CHAIR FISHER: I moved it.

17 SECRETARY SINGH: Okay.

18 CHAIR FISHER: No this is an item which we ask be
19 incorporated into the upcoming California MUTCD, the proposed
20 changes and language. We would expect those to be in the
21 published document, as well as the sign as proposed. Okay.

22 We move on to item number 11-15, which was also one
23 that I initiated. Item 11-15 starts on page 18. And I
24 consider this more of a technical matter, not so much a policy
25 matter, but we'll see which way the discussion goes.

1 I bring to your attention, as you look on page 20,
2 the various pedestrian plaques that are used on traffic
3 signals. And they -- the ones that are shown indicate "Push
4 Button to Cross Maple Street," or something similar to that,
5 "Push Button to Cross."

6 It came to my attention that -- that that certainly
7 reflects the traditional use of a pedestrian push button to
8 activate the pedestrian phase. But now with accessible
9 pedestrian signals there's another person of the button, and
10 the button can be used to bring on the sounds that advise the
11 blind that the walk is in effect. And it could be used at a
12 pre-timed signal. It could be used at a non-actuated approach.
13 So there's a second use of push buttons for accessible
14 pedestrian signal. In the traditional sense you could use it
15 to activate the walk, but you can also use it to activate the
16 accessible pedestrian features which tell you when you may
17 walk.

18 And so we contacted the FHWA and said,
19 "You have no push button that you display on Figure 2B-26,
20 which appears on page 20, that shows that second newer
21 application to activate accessible pedestrian devices."

22 And they said, "You're right." And they said, "When
23 we revise the next MUTCD we'll be sure to show those."

24 So I thought for use in California we would get a
25 head start on that and we would show the plaques that can be

1 used when you are simply pushing the button to activate the
2 accessible pedestrian features, not to actuate the phase.

3 So what we would do is add eight new plaques to
4 Figure 2B-26. They would be similar to the plaques that are
5 shown, the R10-3B through R10-3I. And, again, they're shown at
6 the bottom of page 20. But those proposed new plaques would be
7 without the arrow and without the message "Push Button to
8 Cross" or "Push Button to Cross Maple Drive," because, again,
9 you would be using those in applications where you are simply
10 bringing on the accessible pedestrian features, not bringing on
11 the phase.

12 And therefore, if you add those eight new plaques,
13 tentatively you could label them R3 -- R10-3J through R10-3Q or
14 as otherwise determined by Caltrans. And in doing that you
15 would have to adopt some new language to clarify their use.
16 And that new language is shown on Page 21, which would be added
17 to Section 2B.52. That language is shown in red, and I will
18 read it to you.

19 "Support: Pedestrian push buttons are used to actuate
20 pedestrian signal timing, to activate accessible
21 pedestrian signals or both. See Section 4E.09 regarding
22 the application of accessible pedestrian signals and
23 detectors.

24 "The R10.3J through R10.3Q signs have applications as
25 described for the corresponding R10-3B through R10-3I

1 signs, except where the pedestrian signal timing is no-
2 actuated and the pedestrian push buttons are used solely
3 to activate accessible pedestrian signals.

4 "Option: The R10-3J through R10-3Q signs may be used
5 where pedestrian push buttons activate accessible
6 pedestrian signals and the pedestrian signal timing is
7 non-actuated."

8 So with the addition of those signs and with this
9 language here it would hope to clarify what can be used when
10 you are simply activating accessible pedestrian features. And
11 so this is intended to give California a head start so that
12 agencies know what to use when they encounter this. And I know
13 in the City of L.A. it's become urgent for us because we are --
14 we've made it a practice now, wherever we've put in push
15 buttons to put in accessible pedestrian features, and at those
16 locations where the walk time is either pre-timed or non-
17 actuated we are going with these accessible pedestrian buttons
18 and we need to have a sign that shows what is appropriate to
19 use. So we wanted to give California a head start. So that's
20 my proposal on this item.

21 With that I'd like to turn it over to the committee
22 to ask questions and make comments.

23 Jeff?

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: It seems to me like we
25 need some additional information on these signs, and it's hard

1 to recommend that because I already can't read all the text
2 that are on these tiny displays. But in the new MUTCD it
3 allows us to time traffic signals with a background pedestrian
4 clearance timing based on four feet per second, and then
5 provide crossing times based on three-and-a-half feet per
6 second if the button is depressed for two seconds or longer.
7 And it also requires that a sign inform pedestrians of that
8 option to press the button for two seconds or longer.

9 And I was squinting at these signs to see if there's
10 any mention of the fact that if you need to push the button for
11 two seconds or longer to get some of the special functions.
12 Because in researching audible push buttons like the Polaris
13 button what we have found is that in trying to reach a
14 compromise between trying to help the sight impaired to cross
15 the street, and yet not drive the local businesses, fire
16 station or residents crazy. They're buttons, if you push the
17 button for two seconds or more then it activates the audible
18 system, whereas normally it just operates like a normal
19 pedestrian push button. And we don't have any standardized way
20 of delivering that two-second message, whether it's for the
21 longer pedestrian clearance interval, actually the longer walk
22 because we don't change the clearance interval, or if it's to
23 activate the audible device.

24 And as far as I can tell in reading all this text and
25 trying to zoom in on the computer, none of these reference the

1 two-second rule, even as it states now on the Federal MUTCD
2 that if you're going to have -- if you're going to require a
3 couple extra seconds to activate special features you need to
4 have a placard that says so.

5 CHAIR FISHER: Good point. I think there's a lot of
6 work that needs to be done at the federal level to provide
7 signs that reflect the text.

8 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: But I think what's
9 important about standardizing it is that the standard sign
10 bracket that actually holds the sign on the signal needs some
11 standard, understandable language that doesn't change from
12 jurisdiction to jurisdiction, and also so that we can kind of
13 formalize the hardware that we use on the signal poles.
14 Because it's low it's something we don't people, you know,
15 bumping into, so that typically it actually fits on a housing
16 with no edges of any sign that extend out from the pole that
17 anybody can snag themselves on.

18 So I'd hate to put something off until later. If
19 we're going to adopt a new push button standard and it's part
20 of the 2011 or 2012 California MUTCD and there is a requirement
21 to post the two-second, that it should be incorporated now
22 rather than doing an interim sign, planning on an updated
23 version of this a few months down the road. It's already
24 required in the MUTCD that we're -- that we're adopting.

25 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: So, Knowles, if the two-

1 second rule is going to be referred to, to activate the
2 audible, then shouldn't that be engraved? Because -- because
3 if you put the text, the whole purpose of the audible signal
4 pedestrian is for the vision impaired.

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Right. And many of these
6 signs have a Braille message that's --

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Yeah. So -- but if --

8 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: -- that's on the sign.

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Yeah. But if -- so the
10 sign has to be actually engraved to be of value to the person
11 who can also benefit from the audible signal. Otherwise, he's
12 not going to -- he or she is not going to be able to see the
13 words "two-second."

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Right. All I'm saying is
15 the new MUTCD says that we have to have a sign that refers to
16 the two seconds. And as far as I can tell none of these refer
17 to the two seconds. So that for agencies either using the
18 audible pedestrian push button it requires two seconds of
19 depression, or using the extended walk time that requires the
20 two seconds the feds say you have to have a sign that states
21 that at the push button, and none of these meet that
22 requirement. And we don't have any example of what that sign
23 should look like.

24 CHAIR FISHER: I certainly value what you're saying.
25 I would offer that it's a related issue but a different issue.

1 We did not attempt to try to develop a standard sign
2 for that because I think it needs some vetting at the federal
3 level as to what the format of the sign should be. How do you
4 get the message across clearly? I think that needs some
5 testing to know what -- to make sure that people can easily
6 understand the message. What we tried to do here was just
7 restrict ourselves to the issue of using the push buttons for
8 accessible purposes only.

9 And -- but I certainly value what you're saying. I
10 do think there's a need for that. We didn't attempt to try to
11 tackle that on this agenda item.

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: So just be aware, later in
13 our agenda we're going to be, theoretically, adopting the new
14 California MUTCD. We're going to adopt language that says
15 agencies -- I think -- I can't remember whether it's shall or
16 should post a sign that says you need to tell people about
17 those two seconds, and we don't have any approved signs that
18 actually relays that information. And we're on the exact
19 subject of the exact sign that would need to relay that
20 message.

21 CHAIR FISHER: Well, not the exact sign. Part of the
22 sign that says --

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Well, the pedestrian push
24 button sign, yes.

25 CHAIR FISHER: Yeah. I do think it needs vetting at

1 the federal level, though, to know what -- what we're --

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: I'm just saying, in terms
3 of liability for local agencies, here you've got a requirement
4 to post a sign and then there's no sign established to post.

5 SECRETARY SINGH: (Off mike.) We can bring another
6 new agenda item to -- covering that sign. So next meeting we
7 can -- we developed it before, the Braille sign, then we
8 adopted the warning lighting. So we can develop a Braille sign
9 and bring new -- as a separate agenda item.

10 CHAIR FISHER: Okay.

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Mr. Chairman, one
12 question.

13 CHAIR FISHER: Yes.

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: And maybe Mr. Bhullar
15 knows this also. Is there anywhere in MUTCD, Federal or
16 California, what would define what's the difference between a
17 pedestrian signal and accessible pedestrian signal? If --
18 if -- I see Johnny shaking his head to the negative. If that's
19 what he means or if he's just -- just shaking his head. No, he
20 means no.

21 But -- but if that's the case, then by introducing
22 this section when I'm meeting as a practitioner how do I know
23 what does an accessible pedestrian signal mean and what's the
24 difference between accessible pedestrian signal and any other
25 regular pedestrian signal?

1 CHAIR FISHER: Are you asking that of Johnny Bhullar?

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: I'm -- I'm asking --

3 CHAIR FISHER: Yeah, there is a section. I think

4 it's Section 4E. It talks about pedestrian detectors.

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: But

6 CHAIR FISHER: And --

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: But do we define the term

8 accessible pedestrian signal?

9 CHAIR FISHER: Yes. But Johnny can answer that more

10 definitely.

11 MR. BHULLAR: Johnny Bhullar with Caltrans.

12 Actually, since we have Ahmad I would rather have a Ahmad

13 probably help us with that question.

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Because if it does -- and

15 again I don't mean to put Johnny on the spot because who -- who

16 knows, I mean, it's like a 1,200 page document. We all don't

17 remember whatever is in the MUTCD.

18 But if there is a reference, if there is a

19 definition, I suggest that here we add, we say "Accessible

20 Pedestrian Signal" in parenthesis "As Defined in Section" --

21 blah, blah. Or if there is no definition then we need to

22 define it here.

23 CHAIR FISHER: Well, again, in the support statement

24 we say "See Section 4E.09 regarding the application of

25 accessible pedestrian signals."

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Yeah. It says the
2 application, but does it have a definition of the accessible --
3 I mean, he can look it up quickly.

4 CHAIR FISHER: Where's the definitions?

5 (Colloquy Between Committee Members)

6 SECRETARY SINGH: On page 11 of the 2009 MUTCD.

7 CHAIR FISHER: Page 11. Yeah.

8 "Accessible pedestrian signals," definition number one in
9 the MUTCD, and it says, "A device that communicates
10 information about pedestrian signal timing in a non-visual
11 format such as audible tones, speech, messages and/or
12 vibrating surfaces." That's the first definition.

13 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Okay.

14 CHAIR FISHER: Okay. Ahmad.

15 MR. RASTEGARPOUR: I just wanted to share that --
16 Ahmad Rastegarpour from Caltrans -- that the MUTCD 2009 has
17 already clarified --

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Defined it.

19 MR. RASTEGARPOUR: -- defined it, yes.

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Okay.

21 CHAIR FISHER: Okay. Further discussion by members?

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: None.

23 CHAIR FISHER: Okay. We'll go to any member of the
24 audience who would wish to comment on this item.

25 Yes, you'll be next and --

1 MS. PRICE: Oh, I'm -- I'm sorry. I'm Lindell Price.
2 I live at 3672 Millbrae Road in Cameron Park, California. And
3 I'm not sure if I followed the discussion, but it sounded like
4 you may be recommending removing the arrow. And even if the
5 sign is used for accessible features, the person using it still
6 needs to know which street it would be activating. And I'd
7 also ask you to keep in mind that some people have multiple
8 disabilities. And thank you very much for addressing this
9 issue. I very much appreciate it. And I hope we can get as
10 good a sign as possible that will really work for us. Thank
11 you.

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Wait. Can I ask a
13 question of the speaker, Mr. Chairman?

14 CHAIR FISHER: Yes. Can you stay up there? He --

15 MS. PRICE: Oh. Okay.

16 CHAIR FISHER: There was a question for you. Can
17 you -- ma'am, can you come back to the podium?

18 MS. PRICE: Oh. Yes.

19 CHAIR FISHER: Mr. Bahadori had a question --

20 MS. PRICE: Yes.

21 CHAIR FISHER: -- for you.

22 MS. PRICE: Yes. Sorry.

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Just one quick question
24 for you, ma'am.

25 MS. PRICE: Yes?

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: So do you think that
2 these plates are more effective or maybe even only effective
3 when they're also provided in Braille, not only text language?

4 MS. PRICE: You know, I -- I certainly remember
5 seeing a sign in Sacramento that had written on it, "Press
6 Button to Activate Audible Signal." And I thought it -- it
7 some ways it struck me as ridiculous because the person who
8 needed the audible signal --

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: He can't see it.

10 MS. PRICE: -- probably couldn't read the sign. But
11 I think the man right behind me would be in a better position
12 to answer your question.

13 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Okay. Thank you.

14 MR. THOM: Yes. Mr. Chair and Members, my -- my name
15 is Jeff Thom. I'm presenting the California Council of the
16 Blind. And the address is 1510 J Street, Sacramento.

17 I would only say very briefly that I greatly
18 appreciate the work that has gone on under this item. It is an
19 important one, and I value what -- what has been done so far.

20 I do agree that if at all possible, the more
21 information the better. And especially the fact that the two-
22 second rule is in effect is an important piece of information
23 to have because many people who use them will not know about
24 that.

25 I also agree that Braille can be very important

1 for -- because you do look at the area around the signal, just
2 as having, you know, large print would be important for those
3 with vision loss. Thank you very much.

4 MR. HAGGSTROM: Richard Haggstrom, 609 Osti Drive
5 (phonetic), Davis, California.

6 I just want to thank the committee for being
7 proactive in this area. I think it's -- I think one of the
8 main reasons to even have this committee is to allow California
9 to achieve a higher standard more quickly than -- than the
10 nation as a whole. And I think this is a step in the right
11 direction.

12 I also think that it is important to come up quickly
13 with the special sign for the two-second activation. And I
14 think that if this committee takes it up quickly we could be
15 leading the country in that regard. Thank you.

16 CHAIR FISHER: Any other speakers from the audience?
17 Steve.

18 MR. PYBURN: Steve Pyburn, Federal Highway
19 Administration.

20 As we know, California is a trend setter in many
21 areas. However, we have to do it under federal law. And
22 without seeing what plaques are proposed I have -- I can't
23 really support saying this is being in substantial conformance,
24 although it's also difficult to see how it could be out of
25 substantial conformance.

1 The federal process, though, is that if something is
2 not in the manual you have to propose to add it to the manual,
3 not just go ahead and add it to the manual and have the rest of
4 the country catch up.

5 So we'll work with the Caltrans on editing the
6 version and the proposal, but I can't -- without seeing what
7 those -- what those plaques are and vetting it through our D.C.
8 office, we may not be able to support adding it at this time.

9 CHAIR FISHER: Steve, it would be pretty simple.
10 The -- it would be the plaques that we show here but without
11 that lower portion.

12 MR. PYBURN: Until I see the picture of the plaque
13 that's going to be physically added we can't support --

14 CHAIR FISHER: Okay.

15 MR. PYBURN: -- the proposal.

16 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Do you know anything about
17 any testing of any signs that refer to the two or more second
18 depression rule of -- the activation rule? Because we're
19 required to put in that sign. We're using that timing right
20 now in Vacaville and we're required to put in a sign. Now
21 we're letting our Pedestrian Advisory and our Council on Aging
22 know we're setting these signals up this way. I'm not really
23 anxious to tell my high school buttons to push the button for a
24 longer period of time.

25 But I would -- any testing or any sign that you know

1 of, now that the manual says we're supposed to put the sign in?

2 MR. PYBURN: Is that being done under
3 experimentation?

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: No.

5 MR. PYBURN: -- in Vacaville? No?

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: No. It's --

7 MR. PYBURN: All right.

8 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: The manual clearly states
9 that if -- if you set up a system where the depression of the
10 push button activates the 3.5 feet per second crossing time
11 that you can use the default to the 4 second time. And it
12 also, in another portion of the manual, says if you use that
13 extended time you have to let the pedestrians know in a placard
14 to push the button for two seconds, but there's no sign in the
15 manual that delivers that information.

16 MR. PYBURN: Okay. Like John stated earlier, I think
17 that's a different issue than what's being acted on today. The
18 request is to add nine plaques or six, whatever, to the MUTCD.
19 That separate, then what do we do in the case that's already
20 been established by Federal Highway and D.C.

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Right. Because it would
22 be --

23 MR. PYBURN: They should take that up with Federal
24 Highway in D.C. We're not -- in California all we can do is
25 say, yes, you comply or maybe you don't comply with the federal

1 manual.

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Well, I have a question.

3 MR. PYBURN: But I agree, it's a dilemma.

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: I have a question
5 following up on what Mr. Knowles said, Stephen. But why
6 wasn't, at the federal level, this discussion, that if we are
7 given the authority to use the two-second, or actually making
8 it mandatory if you want to deviate from 3.5, to come up with a
9 sign?

10 MR. PYBURN: Why would somebody in D.C. do something?
11 I can't answer that.

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: No. I understand that.
13 You know, I'm just -- just playing on the -- on the public
14 sentiment against federal government. I'm not running for
15 office.

16 But what I'm saying, I'm -- I'm serious now, if -- if
17 it's something that the -- the federal manual has allowed and
18 they did not address, what is the harm of the state addressing
19 it at the state level?

20 MR. PYBURN: Again, the proposal is to add six
21 specific plaques that are not shown, and that's what -- I'm
22 just stating --

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: No. No. No.

24 MR. PYBURN: -- that until we see the plaques we can
25 support or --

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Well, these six
2 plaques -- these six plaques are not dealing with the two-
3 second rule. What I'm saying is that, for example, for a city
4 like Vacaville, or any other city in California, what is the
5 harm of them when the federal manual is silent on that sign to
6 develop their own sign and use it to comply with the federal
7 requirement?

8 MR. PYBURN: Okay. The -- I mean, taking up --
9 that's the whole reason we have an experimentation process.
10 There are no sharrows in the federal manual. What's the harm
11 of just putting them on the street or green pavement. What's
12 the harm of that? Well, there's a process to determine that
13 the public can readily understand what the meaning of those are
14 and take appropriate action. This is a pedestrian crossing
15 issue.

16 My only point is that without seeing the plaques I
17 can't say, hey, it's a great idea or it's not a great idea.

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: I hear you. Thank you.

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: My point was simply
20 there's nothing in the federal manual that says thou shalt put
21 down sharrows and then not tell us what that is. But there is
22 a section in the federal book that says you should tell the
23 pedestrians about this two-section activation rule -- it
24 actually says should -- but then there's no sign that actually
25 delivers that message. So it's -- I don't know whether we're

1 supposed to experiment with the sign that we're required to
2 use, which is I don't like, you know, the -- the bike boxes and
3 the sharrows and colored pavement and other things that are
4 clearly experimental but not referenced or -- or even said you
5 may use these things.

6 But from a liability standpoint I'm concerned because
7 it actually says I should use a sign that doesn't exist.

8 MR. PYBURN: You could make a word sign that does
9 what you want to do and apply it with little oversight from our
10 office. If it has pictures on it, that's a different story.

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Thank you.

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Well, I think you gave us
13 a solution. We are going to have a picture sign that's in
14 compliance with the federal manual, then create a second small
15 plate where we put our own word text. There you go.

16 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: You know, I think that
17 was -- you know, it had to be an oversight, the fact that, you
18 know, the Federal MUTCD specified that you should have a sign
19 and there's no sign.

20 I think what Caltrans will do is we'll commit to the
21 next meeting to coming forth with that sign. And so we'll have
22 a proposed, you know, a mockup for the next meeting. It's all
23 we can do, really.

24 CHAIR FISHER: A mockup for the two-second
25 application?

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: For the two-second sign,
2 yes.

3 SECRETARY SINGH: In Braille.

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: In Braille.

5 CHAIR FISHER: Well, the two seconds is not just for
6 the blind. The two seconds is for the slower elderly --

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: Yeah. I mean, the point is
8 that --

9 CHAIR FISHER: -- who -- who may have --

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: Yeah, I know.

11 CHAIR FISHER: -- visual capability.

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: Yeah. But, you know, the
13 point is that sign is referenced and it's obviously an
14 oversight somewhere along the line. And I'm surprised it
15 wasn't picked up in the comments. Maybe it was. We'll have to
16 address that very quickly.

17 SECRETARY SINGH: Well, we will have word message.
18 And underneath word message we will have Braille. So we can
19 solve for the blind and the people who can -- who can read.

20 CHAIR FISHER: Okay. So that will be brought to the
21 committee at a future date.

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: Yeah. We have to do that
23 now.

24 CHAIR FISHER: Okay. Any other comments from the
25 public?

1 With that, we bring it back to the committee. Since
2 it was my item I'm going to move approval of the red language
3 as shown, with the understanding that Caltrans create eight new
4 plaques that eliminate the bottom panel as shown on the plaques
5 R10-3B through R10-3I. And certainly they would have to be
6 reviewed by the FHWA. But, again, it's only eliminating the
7 bottom panel, so I don't think that would be too difficult.
8 And it would be intended then that these eight plaques be a
9 part of the adopted California MUTCD.

10 So that is the motion. Do we have a second?

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: I have a second for
12 purpose of discussion. I'll second your motion. I have a
13 question.

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: I have discussion, also.

15 CHAIR FISHER: Okay.

16 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: So -- so that I
17 understand, these from B through I, R10-3B through R10-3I,
18 these signs, these are the new proposed signs that you want to
19 put in there?

20 CHAIR FISHER: No.

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Or these are the ones you
22 take out?

23 CHAIR FISHER: No. These would remain. And these
24 would be used where the crosswalk is actuated.

25 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Okay.

1 CHAIR FISHER: What I'm proposing to do is add eight
2 more signs --

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Okay.

4 CHAIR FISHER: -- that would look just like B through
5 I, but would eliminate the bottom panel so --

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Which -- which has the
7 arrow?

8 CHAIR FISHER: Which is the "Push Button to Cross"
9 message. So it would eliminate that bottom panel. So we'd
10 have eight new signs that look like B through I, but without
11 the bottom panel.

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Mr. Chairman, then I would
13 be voting to oppose this. I guess I'm not clear on the
14 procedure here. If anybody else were coming forward to the
15 committee we'd want them to get federal approval to experiment
16 or federal okays before we add something like this to the
17 manual. I don't know why we would be supporting this when we
18 were just told this hasn't been vetted by the FHWA, and also
19 why we wouldn't want to include this discussion? Because
20 you're taking up space here of this two second rule so that
21 very clearly, whether it's whether Braille would be added, what
22 other messages are needed on these signs, and then have the
23 federal approval to -- to move forward with something like that
24 if the committee -- it just sounds like we're missing a step in
25 approaching the feds first on this issue.

1 CHAIR FISHER: Well, I did contact the FHWA on this
2 matter, Scott Wanewright. And he had indicated that the
3 exclusion was an oversight and that it will be considered for
4 the next edition of the MUTCD. He also indicated that the sign
5 that the City of Los Angeles is currently using which excludes
6 the bottom panel legend would be acceptable.

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: So then if you could
8 explain. I'm not clear. Because I thought what you were
9 saying was the reason why you wanted these signs was because at
10 some fixed time operations and other signals you have to push
11 the button to get the pedestrian indications to come on.

12 CHAIR FISHER: No.

13 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: And --

14 CHAIR FISHER: No. You have to push the button to
15 get the accessible noise pedestrian indication. In other
16 words, the walk is going to come up automatically without
17 pressing a button. The only purpose of pressing a button,
18 we'll be able to hear the audible noises.

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: So what does the lower
20 panel say? Because right now it's only part of those placards
21 that say "Press Button to Cross Street." Is it going to say
22 "Press Button to Activate Audible Signal?" It seems like it's
23 the lower panel that's the most important part of your message
24 that you need to press button to cause the signal to react.
25 And that's not a part of those lower signs that says "Press

1 Button."

2 CHAIR FISHER: In other words, you don't have to
3 press the button to cross the street.

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: But -- but you need to
5 press the button to activate the audible signal. And it's the
6 only part of the sign -- well, what I'm saying is would you
7 eliminate the lower panel or are you changing the language in
8 the lower panel, not just the street name, but you want to be
9 able to tell somebody, press button to activate audible signal,
10 to -- and that's the only -- the rest of the sign is just
11 explaining, what does the walk mean and what does the flashing
12 don't walk --

13 CHAIR FISHER: Okay.

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: -- what is the solid.
15 This is the only information that relates to what you're --

16 CHAIR FISHER: Right.

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: -- the message you're
18 trying to relay.

19 CHAIR FISHER: Consider that the accessible devices
20 are for the blind, so they can not read the panel. Okay. The
21 way the blind know that there's an accessible device is that
22 there's a locator tone that directs them to the push button.
23 So the blind are directed to the push button through a locator
24 tone, and they press the button. And that way they know that
25 when they press the button, when the walk comes up they'll

1 either hear some sort of audible sound or vibrating sound. So
2 the blind will not be able to read this panel.

3 The reason why the panel would exclude the words
4 "Push Button to Cross Maple Drive" is so that the sighted won't
5 be fooled into thinking that they have to press the button to
6 get the walk because the walk is going to come up
7 automatically. And that's why the FHWA said that excluding the
8 bottom panel for purposes of having the push button solely to
9 activate the accessible features would be acceptable and would
10 be incorporated into the next MUTCD.

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Just since we're having
12 the discussion, generally what I've done for the visually
13 impaired is I usually think of them as impaired and not
14 completely blind. I mean, quite often they can see the
15 crosswalk lines and they use that for guidance. Even though
16 they are legally blind they're not totally blind. So the --
17 the messages are helpful, even to those who are sight --
18 visually impaired, and that Braille on such signs, Braille
19 messages, even on the audible push buttons, are very helpful.

20 So is it just the space this is taking up that you
21 want that to disappear or --

22 CHAIR FISHER: The only objective here was not to
23 give a false message to the -- those who can see, to not give
24 the message to them that they have to press the button to get
25 the walk because the walk is going to come up on a pre-timed

1 basis. That's the only reason to eliminate the bottom panel
2 when you use it solely for accessible purposes.

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Mr. Chairman, can I ask a
4 question?

5 CHAIR FISHER: Yeah.

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: If you have a fixed-time
7 signal which the walk comes automatically on, which you have a
8 lot of them in Downtown L.A. and a lot of other downtown grid-
9 type systems, why do you want to post any sign? Why do you
10 want to even have a push button?

11 CHAIR FISHER: Supposing I had --

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: I mean, if it --

13 CHAIR FISHER: -- a down tone --

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: If it's the automatic
15 fixed time, that the walk comes with every new cycle, why do
16 you want to even have a push button to begin with?

17 CHAIR FISHER: Because supposing I have -- I'll give
18 you two examples.

19 I have a transit station, a subway station nearby
20 that's used by the sight impaired and they need to cross. They
21 cross in great numbers. They don't know when to cross.
22 Example number one. Because unless you give them some sort of
23 messages to locator tones and other messages they may not know
24 when to cross. Example number one.

25 Example number two, I've got multi-phasing at an

1 intersection where I've got left turn arrows, right turn
2 overlaps, and it would be very difficult for the blind to know
3 when the walk is on because of all the overlapping motor noise.
4 Even if the walk comes on automatically, even if the walk does
5 not depend on pressing a button, I would still want to let them
6 know when it is safe for them to cross.

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: And that's fine. And
8 that's -- or maybe I have to rephrase my question.

9 If the walk automatically comes on and does not need
10 actuation by any device you're not going to put even a
11 pedestrian push button to put any plate to go with it or any
12 plaque to go with it. If you are concerned about, like you
13 have visually impaired or blind that are -- have a high
14 presence in those areas you can put an audible pedestrian
15 signal. And that audible pedestrian signal for that direction
16 comes on automatically every single time where you have --
17 where you have a walk sign. The chirper just comes on or
18 whatever form of audible sign you have, whenever you have a
19 walk sign it comes on.

20 CHAIR FISHER: Right.

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: And I think like in
22 Pasadena that's exactly what's happening, at least a couple of
23 Gold Line stations, as far as I remember, that the audible
24 sign -- the audible pedestrian noise, that comes on
25 automatically every time you have a walk sign.

1 CHAIR FISHER: Right. But they have a push button,
2 as well.

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Yeah. But -- but if it
4 is a fixed time and the walk comes on, why do you need a push
5 button? That's my question. Because you're going to default
6 back to walk anyways. We are going to give people walk time,
7 whether there is a pedestrian demand or not. And if you are
8 giving them a walk time why do you need a push button to worry
9 about what kind of plaque to put there.

10 CHAIR FISHER: Well, there are some locations where
11 you don't want the noise to come on every cycle. And you want
12 it to come up when someone has indicated they need to use it.

13 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Okay.

14 CHAIR FISHER: So you could have a locator tone that
15 reflects ambient noise levels --

16 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Yeah.

17 CHAIR FISHER: -- that directs them to say this is an
18 accessible pedestrian signal, directs them to the push button.
19 And then they can press the push button so that they can get
20 the noise format to tell them when it's safe to cross.

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: I understand that.

22 CHAIR FISHER: Right.

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: And that's -- that's good
24 practice, actually. But I'm willing to -- I struggle to
25 solve -- to at least come to some kind of balances that what we

1 are talking about is very minority type locations versus an
2 overall overwhelming majority of intersections. That I
3 understand Mr. Knowles concern about kind of, maybe, a little
4 bit hastily removing the signs or modifying them.

5 CHAIR FISHER: Well, we just need a plate that goes
6 with that situation when you elect to use that situation.

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Okay. So -- so what
8 you're looking for is an informational placard that doesn't
9 have the arrow and the push button to cross street.

10 So the question would be, do we really need, you
11 know, seven or eight additional signs or do you just need one
12 of these that's, as an example, the informational placard with
13 the push button -- without the "Push button to Cross Street?"
14 I mean, why add so many additional signs, instead of just
15 picking one of these without the bottom and saying this is --
16 this is the informational placard.

17 CHAIR FISHER: Only because the eight signs shows,
18 some of them have the -- use -- use the symbol for the hand, or
19 sometimes they use the word don't walk. Sometimes they show
20 the countdown feature, sometimes they don't. It was only for
21 those reasons that I suggested showing all the options.
22 Because if you don't show it someone is going to say, well, it
23 didn't say I could use this when I had this situation.

24 So I acknowledge it would be a number of extra signs.
25 But again I'm told that's the direction the FHWA is going to go

1 to when they submit their next addition of the MUTCD.

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: You know, I hate
3 introducing new signs. I'm all in favor of modifying and
4 playing with what we have. What do you see the harm of adding
5 eight signs at the bottom of these and not touching these?

6 CHAIR FISHER: That's my proposal, to add eight
7 signs.

8 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: No, no, no. But I
9 thought you were also proposing to get rid of the bottom part.

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: No. He's starting with J
11 and going through Q or something.

12 CHAIR FISHER: Yeah. So we --

13 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: This is all -- it's all
14 new signs.

15 CHAIR FISHER: We would keep these signs.

16 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: But only modify the
17 bottom part?

18 CHAIR FISHER: And add eight new ones that would look
19 just like this, only without the bottom half.

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: So back to Mr. Knowles
21 concern, if in the future we want to use the space that's used
22 for arrow now for two-second rule or whatever we can do that,
23 can't we?

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Yeah. We just have to
25 come back to this issue a second time.

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: I don't see us being able
2 to resolve it now for the two-second because as we struggle
3 here -- somebody has to put it through experimentation and all
4 that anyway.

5 SECRETARY SINGH: No. It's already in the MUTCD, the
6 two -- the two-second option.

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Right. That -- that's
8 already there, there just isn't a sign. That's --

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: It doesn't have a sign.

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Mr. Chairman, my concern
11 would be since we're all moving towards the symbolic signs, I
12 mean, as they burn out, as the old incandescent walks burn out
13 we're replacing them generally with LED walking men. It would
14 be nice to simplify this. Because you -- you can imagine if we
15 had all of these signs plus eight more signs plus the two-
16 second option signs, I mean, it is so many signs. It would be
17 nice if move towards -- and that one of the original purposes
18 of this whole manual was to try to standardize the signs so we
19 don't end up with 100 different types of signs that deliver
20 virtually the exact same message so they're instantly
21 recognizable by the public.

22 And so it just seems like this is a step in the wrong
23 direction to add 8 more duplicate signs that have -- are just
24 slightly a different message, knowing that we've got -- that
25 we're going to have to come up with 16 signs total when we add

1 the two-second rule to these 16 signs. You know, doesn't it
2 seem like we're moving away from standardizing the signs, which
3 is kind of the purpose of the manual in the first place?

4 CHAIR FISHER: Well, I think you bring up a good
5 point. I mean, I don't know of many jurisdictions that are
6 using the words "Don't Walk." They're using the hand. I think
7 this is just shown here to reflect the use of it. I mean, I'd
8 be perfectly happy just to have two new signs that reflect 10-
9 3E and 10-3I because you're required now to have countdown
10 features.

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Right.

12 CHAIR FISHER: But there is this period of compliance
13 you're allowed to go through. So again --

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: But it explains what the
15 hand means --

16 CHAIR FISHER: You know --

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: -- even on that one with
18 the countdown. It has a separate message for --

19 CHAIR FISHER: Yeah.

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: -- the flashing hand.

21 CHAIR FISHER: I just didn't want to restrict
22 Caltrans in saying that, you know, they shouldn't show it. But
23 I think the concept here is -- is the -- the bigger thing,
24 whether it's eight panels -- new panels that we show or two,
25 that let's show the other options without that lower panel.

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Like I said, then we have
2 16 more signs coming with the two-second message.

3 CHAIR FISHER: I'll leave that up to the
4 administrative decision of Caltrans.

5 MR. KLINKER: Hi, my name is Daniel Klinker. I'm
6 with the Sacramento County Department of Transportation. And I
7 am speaking right now as a signal designer. And -- and in this
8 I've -- I'm holding my tongue here, but what I think I would
9 recommend is, first of all, if you put a button on a pole
10 people are going to push it no matter what. And most people
11 don't look at the signs. So if you're going to -- in the
12 situation that you're talking about I would recommend maybe
13 R10-3, "Push Button for Audible." Because all that other
14 information is just going to distract people from what you're
15 trying to achieve.

16 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Mr. Chairman, I --
17 following what the speaker said and what Mr. Knowles said, I'm
18 just -- I'm just -- I know we are living in the age of
19 litigation and covering our behind and all that, but people
20 will just push a button. So --

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: At least once.

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: At least once. The two-
23 second rule is very important, not only for the extended time,
24 but most importantly for the visually impaired. And that has
25 to be engraved to be effective to being with, the text. Who

1 cares what you say? They can't read it anyways. I'm a little
2 concerned that we are going and introducing a whole bunch of
3 signs that really may not even be necessary.

4 CHAIR FISHER: We'll go back to the audience.
5 Harold?

6 MR. GARFIELD: Harold Garfield, consultant. I agree
7 that you do not really need a bunch of new signs. And -- but
8 to solve the problem that John has, why not just delete the two
9 signs and -- and make those the signs that John wants to have,
10 and put the heading on this sheet "Typical Pedestrian Signs and
11 Plaques."

12 If you'll notice in the traffic signal section we put
13 down "Typical Signal Displays," and we had like a dozen
14 displays in the signal section. But that doesn't restrict the
15 designer from using a display that is not shown on that page.
16 In fact, we've used quite a few that were not on that sheet.

17 So go ahead and take -- change the title to
18 "Typical." That covers you legally, at least that's the way it
19 used to be as far as the attorneys were concerned because then
20 you could say that you're following the design in the intent to
21 the MUTCD. Thank you.

22 CHAIR FISHER: Thank you. Are there any more
23 comments from members of the audience? Okay.

24 MR. PATTERSON: Hi, I'm Larry Patterson, Public Works
25 Director for the City of San Mateo. I just wanted, as a

1 suggestion, because I agree that adding that many additional
2 signs isn't necessarily that helpful, but I wonder why it
3 couldn't be done, since it's an option, where in the text you
4 couldn't describe the option that's available to the designer
5 to eliminate the push button, the bottom panel of the sign, if
6 in fact it's a fixed-time signal and you don't need it. So
7 rather than generating all those graphics, just an option
8 bullet that would basically allow the designer that placard if
9 it's not appropriate.

10 CHAIR FISHER: I'd like to bring Johnny Bhullar up.
11 Johnny, a question for you. We had proposed here to retain the
12 eight existing federal signs and not to eliminate them from
13 this sign chart. And we had proposed to have eight new
14 corresponding signs that would correspond with numbers B
15 through -- where is it -- B through I. If this motion should
16 carry do you believe it would be sufficient to just show two
17 examples of the new sign that would exclude the lower panel, or
18 do you think you would have to have a corresponding sign for
19 each of these eight?

20 MR. BHULLAR: Johnny Bhullar with Caltrans. In my
21 opinion, if the real intention is to have the option of not
22 having the lower portion it's better -- a picture is worth a
23 thousand words -- it's better to have all those signs repeated
24 without the plaque underneath. Because just getting lost in
25 the texting, you move it all, like you're suggesting, maybe

1 just on a couple showing on the lower portion, then the intent
2 is going to be, based upon my experience from the field, that
3 only those two signs you can have the option of not having the
4 lower portion, and the others we can't.

5 CHAIR FISHER: Okay.

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: But if I understand the
7 way the manual is set right now signs 10B -- 3B through E are
8 the base signs. And then they've duplicated that with F
9 through I, but adding the street names. So it just seems like
10 we keep -- the base signs are those four signs. The only
11 difference between the first four and the last four is the
12 addition of a street name. Now you want eight or four more
13 that just eliminate the lower -- these are all derivatives of
14 just these four signs.

15 It seems like if we stick with the base four signs
16 and then just have options it's so much more clear than
17 continuing to add additional signs that just keep repeating the
18 basic four over and over again with slight variations. Because
19 the text clearly says that what you're -- what the manual does
20 is it replaces R10-3B through R10-3E with R10-3F through R10-3I
21 if you want to add the street names. So it's really just a
22 repeat. And the only difference is the street names. And then
23 it just seems crazy to then have eight more versions. And then
24 we're going to have to have 16 more versions when we add the
25 two seconds. We just need to have the four basic signs with a

1 series of options that you can add the street name or not. You
2 can put on the two seconds or not, and it would give the exact
3 example of the language. But I don't think we want to move
4 towards having 32 of those darn R10-3 series signs.

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: You know, it's ironic
6 that we are -- we are introducing so many signs for a sign that
7 I think is one of the least valuable and least effective signs
8 in the State of California. Because anybody who pushes a
9 signal knows -- a pedestrian push button knows exactly what he
10 or she is expected to do.

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Well, we used to have a
12 big problem 20 years ago --

13 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: But not anymore.

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: -- with explaining to
15 pedestrians --

16 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Not any --

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: -- what the signals meant.
18 But now that we have the -- the mandatory countdown pedestrian
19 hand those questions have all gone away. Nobody calls anymore
20 saying the walk isn't long enough. We talk now about the
21 countdown to pedestrian clearance. They understand when they
22 have time to cross versus when they need to start.

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: And the signs and the --

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: So the value has --

25 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Yeah.

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: -- decreased over time.

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: These signs are not
3 really needed, but we have it so be it. I'm just -- I'm just
4 thinking, why are we expanding so many on this section? The
5 signs at the intersections that we need are the two seconds and
6 the audible signs for visually impaired, and we are not even
7 discussing those. This is completely different discussion, and
8 this doesn't even improve traffic safety in that area.

9 So potentially we are going to be putting 16 or 24
10 signs in the manual that really is not really needed in
11 California to begin with.

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: But if you could -- if you
13 just had options on those first four that didn't have the --
14 the lower panel that would take care of all of your options,
15 because the latter four repeats in the first four.

16 COMMITTEE MEMBER KU: Mr. Chairman?

17 CHAIR FISHER: Yeah. But let me comment to that,
18 then I'll -- I'll go to you, Dwight.

19 I think you bring up a good point. And I think then
20 instead of adding eight new signs, if we just add four that
21 reflect B through E, eliminate the lower panel, that that takes
22 care of this situation.

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: It's less painful for me.

24 CHAIR FISHER: Add four instead of eight.

25 Mr. Ku?

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER KU: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I
2 tend to agree with the gentleman from -- I think it was San
3 Mateo, who said that all -- perhaps all we really need is a
4 modification of R3 -- R10-3. But if the feeling is that these
5 other signs, R10-3B through 3I, are necessary for whatever
6 reason because of legacy -- and every time you have a change to
7 one of the four panels, or three panels if it's the three-panel
8 sign, you exponentially increase the number of signs that --
9 that may necessarily have to be in the -- in the manual.

10 So I don't know if it's ever been done before in the
11 manual, but is it possible to say one option is to have a
12 three-panel sign, and here are the acceptable versions of the
13 first panel, and you can choose any one of the -- any one of
14 the ones that's provided in the manual? In the second panel --
15 in the second panel you have the option of choosing the
16 following, and then you list out all these, so you don't have a
17 series of eight signs, another eight signs, another eight signs
18 with slight variations. But it's more of this is what should
19 be in the first panel. Pick one of -- whether it's a symbol
20 or -- or words, pick one of those. The second panel, it has to
21 be one of these. If you want a three-panel sign, pick one of
22 these. Here's the third panel.

23 And then you move on to the two-second -- two-second
24 activation and you have the same type of thing, pick one of
25 the -- one of these for the top half, pick one of these for the

1 second panel, pick one of these for the third panel, and then
2 you have the two-second -- push for two seconds to activate the
3 accessible signal.

4 So maybe that will save some of the repetitive number
5 of signs that are in here. Just a suggestion.

6 CHAIR FISHER: Thank you. Yes, Mike?

7 VICE CHAIR ROBINSON: Mr. Chairman, I'm kind of along
8 the same -- the same route as Dwight, except mine is just
9 slightly different. I'm thinking we can take these eight signs
10 that we're -- that we're talking about adding eight more to and
11 simply put a footnote down that identifies that the bottom
12 panel as an option can be removed in a situation where you have
13 a pre-timed signal system. It's -- you don't -- you're not
14 adding signs. You're using those same signs, except you're
15 giving instruction that you can remove the bottom panel when
16 you have a pre-timed signal system.

17 CHAIR FISHER: That would be an alternate way of
18 handling it.

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: And I notice, just what
20 Mr. Robinson just said, you know, if you identify, you put a
21 little cloud, or not -- not over the sign but right next to it,
22 and make sure that you put an asterisk and you put it in the --
23 the footnote in the page, and that -- the lower part as
24 identified is optional, or if you want to take it out, take it
25 out. I don't think the feds are going to have any problem with

1 that either. You're not changing any symbols on that sign.

2 You're just deleting the word part of the sign.

3 CHAIR FISHER: Any other comments by committee
4 members? Yes, Johnny.

5 MR. BHULLAR: I just pulled up the sign, since we
6 were talking about it, at least since it was suggested we bring
7 it back, but the feds already have that push button for two
8 seconds crossing time. So they just released that. Just
9 wanted you to know.

10 CHAIR FISHER: Okay. Thank you for that.

11 SECRETARY SINGH: So we -- we need in Braille, even
12 on these. Actually, we need it in Braille.

13 CHAIR FISHER: Okay. I'd like to see if we can close
14 this item, and then go on a short ten minute break.

15 SECRETARY SINGH: Mr. Chairman?

16 CHAIR FISHER: Yes.

17 SECRETARY SINGH: Can we consider conceptual approval
18 to put this message in Braille in the 2011 California MUTCD?
19 We don't need to bring back. So if committee -- we have text
20 message. So if we put in the Braille the same message and we
21 can include it --

22 CHAIR FISHER: Well --

23 SECRETARY SINGH: -- in the California MUTCD.

24 CHAIR FISHER: -- I don't see this having anything to
25 do with the blind.

1 SECRETARY SINGH: Oh.

2 CHAIR FISHER: I see it having to do with people
3 needing extra time to get across the street.

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Well, I think that's quite
5 often the sight impaired need, extra. But I would certainly
6 encourage them to push the button for extra time. They're not
7 generally our fastest crossers.

8 CHAIR FISHER: Right.

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: I mean, if we need it as a
10 separate motion, it's not agendized. The only way we can get
11 it into the manual, I guess, if it's not in the agenda would be
12 to try to act it on at the same time.

13 CHAIR FISHER: Well --

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: It hasn't been advertised.

15 CHAIR FISHER: -- why don't we agendize this for the
16 next meeting of the committee and we can discuss it at that
17 time. I don't see any controversy regarding that.

18 To try to move things along I'm going to amend my
19 original -- I'm going to withdraw my original motion, and I'm
20 going to amend it to -- I'm going to propose, like the feds
21 expect to show, they're going to show some added plaques, I'm
22 going to amend my proposal not to show eight new plaques but
23 four new plaques that would reflect B through E but would
24 eliminate the lower panel, and ask that those be shown as four
25 new plaques in the California MUTCD. And that would simplify

1 it somewhat. And in doing so that would change the support
2 statement and it would say that the R10-3J through R10-3M, not
3 Q, but M signs have application as described for the
4 corresponding R10-3B through 10-3E signs. So that would be
5 that amendment.

6 And then in the option statement it would say the
7 R10-3J through R10-3M signs may be used, blah, blah, blah. So
8 in other words, instead of adding eight we'll add four, and
9 that maybe can be a compromise.

10 That is the motion. Do we have a second?

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: You mean, second for
12 discussion?

13 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: When there's a motion we
14 need to have a second, otherwise the motion does not go.

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: I mean, for discussion.

16 CHAIR FISHER: If we have no second then the motion
17 fails. Do we have a second? Then not hearing a second, the
18 motion fails.

19 VICE CHAIR ROBINSON: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to
20 propose a new motion.

21 CHAIR FISHER: Okay.

22 VICE CHAIR ROBINSON: That we add an option in a note
23 that --

24 MS. MCLAUGHLIN: Can you use the microphone, please?

25 VICE CHAIR ROBINSON: My motion would be that we add

1 an option in a note that signs 3B, C, D or E may have the
2 bottom panels removed in situations where there is a pre-timed
3 signal system.

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: I second that motion.

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: I'd like a discussion.

6 CHAIR FISHER: Well, Mike, would -- friendly
7 amendment, would you want to -- did you say you want to
8 footnote it in the sign chart?

9 VICE CHAIR ROBINSON: That's correct.

10 CHAIR FISHER: Okay. Would you be amenable to, in
11 that footnote or asterisk, whatever it is, in Figure 2B-26,
12 would you be willing to footnote the eight signs to say that
13 the bottom panel may be eliminated where the push button is
14 used for accessible purposes only?

15 VICE CHAIR ROBINSON: That would be acceptable, as
16 well, at the -- at the pleasure of the committee.

17 CHAIR FISHER: Okay. So that was -- intended to be a
18 friendly amendment. Do you adopt it?

19 VICE CHAIR ROBINSON: That would -- I would agree to
20 amend.

21 CHAIR FISHER: Okay.

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: And I'm seconding the
23 motion --

24 CHAIR FISHER: Okay.

25 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: -- with the amendment.

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Discussion?

2 CHAIR FISHER: Discussion on that motion by Mr.
3 Robinson?

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Have you given any thought
5 to the fact that you're limiting it's use to pre-timed signals?
6 I mean, I can remember in Thousand Oaks we were using just the
7 informational placard without the "Push Button to Cross Street"
8 at virtually all of our traffic signals. It was just the
9 standard sign we put in the space that was above the -- the
10 button on the -- the -- the standard button mounting.

11 So what -- what you're saying is by this language in
12 the footnote, that it's restricted only to those, you know,
13 walk or pre-timed sorts of signals, it doesn't get people to
14 use it elsewhere. I've never clearly seen the value of the
15 arrow because quite often, you know, when we position buttons
16 on poles people get confused about which button is for which
17 crosswalk. They never quite seem to -- they just go to the
18 corner and push all the buttons.

19 I was just wondering, is there any way to modify that
20 footnote such that it's not only restricted to those locations
21 that are pre-timed or only for -- to activate accessible --
22 accessible signals? Why not just any -- couldn't it be used at
23 any pedestrian push button location at the -- at the discretion
24 of the local engineer?

25 VICE CHAIR ROBINSON: Jeff, I think that's

1 reasonable. I'm trying to address John's situation. If -- if
2 a broader application can be brought about by eliminating the
3 note about pre-timed signals, obviously it could still be used
4 in a situation where there are pre-timed signals. So I --
5 if -- if everybody is in general agreement I could -- I would
6 agree to amend the motion to eliminate the issue of the pre-
7 timed signals.

8 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: And I second that
9 amendment. But, yeah, I understand what Mr. Knowles concern
10 is, that it's good to just don't have too many restrictions.
11 Just let them use it wherever they want to use it if they don't
12 need the arrow.

13 SECRETARY SINGH: Basically, I'm confused. And so
14 John is going to bring the exact language of the motion.

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Question.

16 VICE CHAIR ROBINSON: May I -- may I propose the
17 cleaned-up motion?

18 SECRETARY SINGH: Yes, sir.

19 VICE CHAIR ROBINSON: It would be that signs 3B
20 through 3I would have a footnote that identifies the fact that
21 the bottom panel can be removed.

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: And I would second that.

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: That's a good one.

24 CHAIR FISHER: Okay. Just procedural-wise, I support
25 the intent of the motion. We're footnoting a -- we're

1 footnoting a figure, but we need corresponding language in the
2 text that supports that footnote. So if -- see if -- if this
3 is acceptable to you.

4 We would add a footnote to Figure 2B-26 that would
5 apply to -- to signs B through I. And the footnote would say,

6 "The bottom panel may be eliminated where pedestrian
7 signal timing is non-actuated and the pedestrian push
8 buttons are used solely to activate accessible pedestrian
9 signals."

10 That would be part one.

11 Part two is that -- the second paragraph of the
12 support statement that I had proposed would be -- would have to
13 read,

14 "The bottom panels of R10-3B through R10-3I may be -- may
15 be eliminated where the pedestrian signal timing is non-
16 actuated and the pedestrian push buttons are used solely
17 to activate accessible pedestrian signals."

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Other pedestrian features?

19 CHAIR FISHER: The proper term is accessible
20 pedestrian signals.

21 So that -- I think if we have that footnote and then
22 we have that language, that gives us the coverage that we need.

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: I -- yeah, I can support
24 that. That's a good idea. It's not going to solve the
25 existing problem, such as City of Thousand Oaks that Mr.

1 Knowles mentioned. But we don't want to be retroactive on this
2 stuff. For future, that's a very good solution. It just tells
3 people what -- what's the purpose of this sign and how they can
4 modify it, when they can modify it.

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: It just makes the
6 application of the footnote very narrow because it's only --

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: I understand.

8 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: -- for accessible
9 features.

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Yeah, I understand. I
11 understand.

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: You could never have an
13 informational placard out there --

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Yeah, I understand.

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: -- unless it's at an --

16 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Yeah. Yeah, I
17 understand.

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: -- an audible --

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Yeah. And maybe -- maybe
20 the intent is that not to use the placard without the arrow,
21 except those cases. And I don't see anything wrong with that.
22 This is a much, much better way, in my opinion, of approaching
23 this, rather than introducing a whole host of new signs to the
24 manual.

25 CHAIR FISHER: Okay. So the proposal was to add a

1 footnote to the figure and to modify the option statement as
2 verbally described. If that is openly the will of the
3 committee I think we'll work with Devinder just to make sure we
4 get it written down as intended.

5 So we have that new motion. We have a second. Do we
6 have any further comments by committee members?

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Well, could it only to B
8 through E instead of continuing to mention all eight, since --
9 since it's really -- everything that it says in F through I is
10 exactly what's said on B through E, except for the addition of
11 the street name. So we're really only dealing with the basic
12 foundation of these signs is just the four signs, 3B through
13 3E, and everything else is a variation on that sign.

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Yeah. You get the same
15 thing if you apply it only to --

16 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Because I don't want to
17 the footnote to apply to the next 16 signs we've added. It
18 really just applies to those four basic signs, that -- that you
19 can add the street name or not. You can delete the bottom
20 panel or not.

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Yeah.

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: But it's just those four
23 signs.

24 CHAIR FISHER: So you're saying it wouldn't apply --

25 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: No.

1 CHAIR FISHER: -- F through I?
2 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: No.
3 VICE CHAIR ROBINSON: I agree with that. I think F
4 through I only adds the street name.
5 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Yeah. That's the only
6 difference.
7 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Yeah. After a while you
8 are not going to use it anyways if your not using the --
9 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Exactly.
10 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: -- the arrow. So why are
11 you concerned?
12 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: All you're doing --
13 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Yeah.
14 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: -- is modifying 3B --
15 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Yeah.
16 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: -- through 3E.
17 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Yeah. If you modify B
18 through E it's going to achieve what you want.
19 CHAIR FISHER: Okay. That's the motion. We have a
20 second. And final discussion on it before we vote?
21 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: And Johnny's okay with
22 it, too.
23 CHAIR FISHER: So, Johnny, did you have a comment?
24 MR. BHULLAR: Johnny Bhullar with Caltrans. Just a
25 minor comment. Actually, since we are trying to act and since

1 the committee here is trying to minimize the number of signs on
2 which that can be done, I have another suggestion, too, that
3 you don't -- you can also take this out of the four. Because
4 this sign basically was put back into the manual only for
5 existing locations where -- since the new policy is that you
6 can not have a word message on these signal heads anymore for
7 the pedestrian, only symbols. So that's another one out of the
8 four if you want to take it out. Just a suggestion.

9 CHAIR FISHER: You mean eliminate it from the sign
10 chart?

11 MR. BHULLAR: From the -- the ones where you want to
12 remove the bottom on.

13 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: On the footnote.

14 MR. BHULLAR: Because this is only for existing where
15 they haven't been upgraded yet to the symbol.

16 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: So you're saying that C
17 is not even needed; right?

18 MR. BHULLAR: Yes. Just a suggestion.

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Well, since we're
20 cleaning it up, I don't see why not.

21 VICE CHAIR ROBINSON: I don't know that it hurts to
22 continue to include it, because we may not have situations
23 where that is modified yet. I think it still would be
24 applicable.

25 CHAIR FISHER: Let's keep in the mind that the

1 federal government is softening its compliant -- its compliant
2 states to allow you to extend compliant states to fit in with
3 your maintenance program. So there could be situations where
4 there's a lot of old equipment out there. And even though many
5 of us think this is outmoded there still is a lot of old
6 equipment that will remain there for the remainder of its
7 useful service life. So it probably wouldn't hurt to show some
8 of the more old-fashioned equipment. Okay.

9 So I'd like to vote on the motion. All those -- all
10 of those in favor of the motion raise your hands. Two, four,
11 five, six. Unanimous. The motion carries. Thank you for
12 that.

13 Let's take a ten minute break now. We'll be back at
14 11:30.

15 (Off the Record From 11:19 a.m., Until 11:34 a.m.)

16 CHAIR FISHER: Let's call the meeting back to order.

17 We'll go now to Item 11-16. Wayne Henley, you're the
18 lead on that, I believe.

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: Yes. A significant program
20 at Caltrans is what we call the Adopt-A-Highway Program, and
21 it's basically operated by our -- the Caltrans Division of
22 Maintenance. And they -- they -- they approached us and they
23 wanted to make some minor changes to the -- to the MUTCD
24 regarding, you know, general information signs and
25 acknowledgment signs. And Don Howe has got the -- the exact

1 details of what they want to change, which is hopefully pretty
2 minor.

3 MR. HOWE: Thank you, Wayne. I'm Donald Howe from
4 Caltrans. Basically, the concern that was expressed from our
5 colleagues in division maintenance was that the new chapter
6 that's new to the 2009 Federal MUTCD has split off what used to
7 be in Chapter 2D for the general heading of "Guide Signs." And
8 there's now the Chapter 2H which is "General Information
9 Signs." And for the first time FHWA has published a section
10 regarding acknowledgment signs, and we commonly refer them to -
11 - to them as Adopt-A-Highway signs.

12 So the language that formally existed in Section
13 2D.48 as shown on the left on page 24 of 68, and the one word
14 that maintenance wanted to delete was the word "flamboyant."
15 There's no technical metric for the word flamboyant, so they
16 said perhaps we can just do -- do without that and go with a
17 similar language to what -- what's in the current MUTCD in
18 California.

19 And moving on, if we look at the support statement in
20 Section 2H.08, "Acknowledgment Signs," instead of going through
21 and identifying company, business, volunteer group, generally
22 they speak about an entity will enter into an agreement to do
23 adopt a highway services. And in the California Code of
24 Regulations for Adopt-A-Highway Program the reference is
25 "courtesy signs." And so for this -- this particular program

1 that's operated on state highways they suggest a courtesy sign
2 for the department's Adopt-A-Highway Program.

3 On page 25 of 68 it's necessary to add an option
4 paragraph that would identify the,

5 "Entities that operate exclusively on the Internet and
6 whose legal name is the same as appears on their web
7 address domain name may be permitted to display their name
8 on their recognition panel."

9 One example Amazon.com.

10 Also, for clarification, under Item 2H.08,
11 standard -- I'm sorry. The -- the option would continue a
12 second paragraph that,

13 "All upper-case letters may be used, initial upper-case
14 and lower-case may be used. Combining large and small
15 upper-case or displaying some words in all upper-case and
16 some in upper-and lower-case is not permitted."

17 So that's consistent with the California Code of
18 Regulation language that is found and is referenced on the
19 bottom of page 25 of 68.

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Can I ask a question, Mr.
21 Chairman, at this point?

22 CHAIR FISHER: Are you -- have you completed your
23 presentation?

24 MR. HOWE: I was just going to summarize the -- the
25 last page and -- and refer to the attachment. But I can take

1 questions as we go.

2 CHAIR FISHER: Well, why don't you complete your
3 presentation and then we'll ask for clarification.

4 MR. HOWE: Okay. On page 26 of 68 there are
5 miscellaneous items there. One example that has been
6 discontinued by the Caltrans Adopt-A-Highway Program is the El
7 Camino Real Adopt-A-Highway sign program. And so they've asked
8 that the old language that is in the current MUTCD, the
9 California MUTCD, be deleted. And that the title on Figure 2H-
10 5, California be deleted as shown here and it be renamed
11 "Adopt-A-Highway Sign Component." And there is a discontinued
12 sign, S16-8, remove that. On the S32 California Panel they
13 would ask that the wording on the sign be "Volunteer Support
14 Call 1 (866) Adopt-A-Highway," and that would be the default
15 message on that sign if there's no sponsor panel or courtesy
16 sign panel that goes on top of that.

17 And then for 5E the recommendation is to just leave
18 it as a blank recognition panel overlay that's just basically
19 blank rather than having what was showing in the California
20 MUTCD current issue.

21 I went through and did as they asked and put in 6F.
22 But as I looked at that further, that's going to be one item
23 that I'm going to ask that we not include in this proposal. So
24 if we -- if we could kindly just delete that. We have an
25 appendix in the California MUTCD that has the federal language

1 for Adopt-A-Call Box. And we do not have an alternative sign,
2 other than what's now in California MUTCD. It's not a part of
3 the Caltrans Adopt-A-Highway Program because it's operated by a
4 county or a multi-county service authority for freeways --
5 freeway emergencies. But it is at least a sign that they can
6 use if they opt to do a program within their call box agency.
7 So we'll keep that in and not remove it. That's the 20 -- SG-
8 25A California sign. But then we would ask that the other
9 items under item six be -- be done, this item to this proposal,
10 and that we would also add an attachment which is Table 2H-1,
11 California, which gives the sizes for conventional roads, and
12 also freeway or expressway, as shown on page 27 or 68.

13 I am available for questions.

14 CHAIR FISHER: Okay. Any questions of Mr. Howe?
15 Hamid?

16 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Just -- just one
17 question. On page 25 --

18 MS. MCLAUGHLIN: The microphone.

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Pardon me?

20 MS. MCLAUGHLIN: The microphone.

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Oh. You can't hear me
22 there?

23 MS. MCLAUGHLIN: No.

24 CHAIR FISHER: Yeah. Turn the microphone on.

25 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: All right. Just one

1 question, on page 25, item three, the right column --

2 MR. HOWE: Yeah.

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: -- okay, is this
4 something that you -- I mean, Caltrans, as part of their Adopt-
5 A-Highway recognition panel design guidelines did that made it
6 to the CCR, or is the CCR telling you how to do it? What are
7 the -- the reason I'm asking is that what is the difference
8 between a business that operates exclusively on Internet, why
9 is it Amazon.com can say Amazon.com but Apple can not say
10 Apple.com?

11 MR. HOWE: I'll just refer to the left-hand column
12 where --

13 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Which, by the way, Amazon
14 does not exclusively operate on the Internet. They have
15 warehouse facilities. They just don't open to public. A
16 facility that operates only online is only online. It does
17 not -- that's splitting hair.

18 But what's -- what's -- why -- why did we need to say
19 exclusively on the Internet?

20 MR. HOWE: What I was told was this information is --
21 is in the California Code of Regulations and they're just
22 basically echoing that.

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: That's -- that was my
24 question --

25 MR. HOWE: Okay.

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: -- whether it made it
2 from the sign guideline to the CCR or the CCR already have said
3 this.

4 MR. HOWE: My understanding is that CCR is -- is
5 worded that way.

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Then -- then we live with
7 what the CCR says. Thanks.

8 VICE CHAIR ROBINSON: Mr. Chairman?

9 CHAIR FISHER: Yes, Mr. Robinson.

10 VICE CHAIR ROBINSON: The County of San Diego has an
11 Adopt-A-Road Program, as well. The county has an Adopt-A-Road
12 Program, as well. And we found after a couple of years of
13 having to filter through them that a lot of people were
14 choosing to advertise their businesses and advertise through
15 the Internet by placing their website name on there versus
16 the -- the entity that they were actually operating under. So
17 we -- we ultimately limited what could be placed on these signs
18 in order to avoid the -- the -- the advertising value. So
19 understand why this -- if it's -- if it's a business that's got
20 that name dot com, fine, we'll accept that. But outside of
21 that we don't -- we don't allow the web address to be
22 advertised on those signs.

23 CHAIR FISHER: Any other comments from committee
24 members? Mr. Robinson?

25 VICE CHAIR ROBINSON: I would move approval of the

1 recommendation with the -- with the noted exception to remove
2 item 6F, I believe.

3 MR. HOWE: That's correct.

4 CHAIR FISHER: Where does that in 6F appear?

5 MR. HOWE: Item 6F recommends removal from the
6 Caltrans sign chart.

7 CHAIR FISHER: On what page, 26?

8 MR. HOWE: Page 26 of 68.

9 CHAIR FISHER: Yeah. All right. So we have a
10 motion. Do we have a second?

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: I'll second it.

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER PRESLEIGH: Second.

13 CHAIR FISHER: I'll let it go to John Presleigh, the
14 second on that.

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER PRESLEIGH: Yes.

16 CHAIR FISHER: Okay. Okay. We've had a motion.
17 It's been seconded. Any comments, discussion for members of
18 the committee? Any comments from members in the audience?
19 Please come up, state your name and your affiliation.

20 MR. BHULLAR: Johnny Bhullar with Caltrans. I have a
21 couple of comments, so I'll go in sequence. First on page 24
22 of 68, on the very first column there, basically when we are
23 deleting the word flamboyant, that's not efficient of the
24 guidance of the shoulds. Steve is -- Steve Pyburn is here in
25 the audience. I wanted to get at least his take on us

1 modifying the guidance. Are they okay with that? So that will
2 be a question to Steve.

3 And then I'll continue on the next page, page 25. So
4 if you can bring that up, Gordon. The first option there on
5 the right side in the column, to me that is modifying the --
6 the National MUTCD standard. And I'm not sure if we have the
7 authority to do that.

8 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Which section, Johnny?

9 MR. BHULLAR: Section -- on page 25.

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Yeah. But what --

11 MR. BHULLAR: The -- the top of -- number 3E that is
12 listed there, basically that is modifying the National MUTCD
13 standard. So I'm not sure if we have the authority to do that.

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: But we do that when the
15 state law preempts. In this case --

16 MR. BHULLAR: Again, that's why I want to have Steve
17 Pyburn's take on it, because we'll be going through it.

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Yes.

19 MR. BHULLAR: Since he's here in the audience that's
20 a question --

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: That's one of -- one of
22 the reasons I asked.

23 MR. BHULLAR: Yeah.

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: And they said that the
25 CCR, the California Code or Regulations is state law.

1 MR. BHULLAR: Then my third comment is going to be on
2 the 3B, the last sentence. The way it is worded it's almost
3 like a shall. So I think we should not leave it in the option
4 because under option the verb has to be may. So we have to say
5 shall or shall not. So I think we need to have it modified,
6 the last sentence, which is,

7 "Combining large and small upper-case or displaying some
8 words in all upper-case and some in upper- and lower-case
9 is not permitted," that's almost we shall not do that.

10 Just my comments.

11 CHAIR FISHER: Good comments. The word is not
12 permitted I think goes beyond an option statement.

13 So, Don, you want to comment on that?

14 MR. HOWE: I'll begin from Johnny's first question or
15 first concept that the first -- the deletion of the word
16 "flamboyant" modifies guidance, federal guidance. And I, too,
17 would like to know the position of our colleague from
18 California Division Office of FHWA.

19 Second, the option to modify a standard by allowing
20 entities that operate exclusively on the Internet whose legal
21 name is the same as appears on the web address domain name,
22 that's something that they did require or did -- did request
23 that we include, such that somebody would be able to identify
24 themselves by their legal business name. I think that's a
25 reasonable concept. Otherwise, how else would the entity be

1 able to define itself?

2 And as far as what's the strength or a may not versus
3 a shall not, we argued that in our office and we find that a
4 may not is just about as strong wording as shall not, if you
5 think about it, and the weakest of the three is should not. So
6 of those three I would welcome Steve's opinion on those
7 concepts. I'm wondering how we could amend the item 3B to
8 state it in a less -- not -- "is not permitted." Perhaps we
9 could say "is discouraged."

10 MR. BHULLAR: Well, Johnny Bhullar with Caltrans. I
11 have a suggestion here. Either you make it into -- I'm not
12 sure what the intent is. But if the intent is you can make it
13 so shall not be permitted, if you want to keep it as a
14 standard --

15 MR. HOWE: Well, it's an option.

16 MR. BHULLAR: But you can change the last sentence
17 and -- you can change the last sentence.

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: That's not a standard.

19 MR. BHULLAR: But I'm not sure what the intent is.
20 If you don't want to permit it then you say "shall not be
21 permitted," or otherwise you can say -- make -- just change it
22 under support if that's how you want to keep it. But clearly,
23 it's a very strong language.

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Mr. Chairman?

25 CHAIR FISHER: Mr. Bahadori?

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Don, so on the -- on the
2 first comment that Mr. Bhullar made on the word "flamboyant," I
3 think that word is actually needed. Because if you take that
4 word out it says the word of any tendency toward advertising.
5 Putting the name of a company or a business or private
6 enterprise on any sign has no other value other than
7 advertising, it's just that it's not a flamboyant form of
8 advertising. Otherwise, companies do not come and adopt
9 highway and engage in Adopt-A-Highway Programs out of their
10 benevolence. They do it for advertising value, as little as it
11 may be. It's just that it's not a flamboyant advertisement,
12 that they have like neon signs and logos and all that.
13 Otherwise, the fact that you put the company name on a sign on
14 a highway, why would a company want to do that, other than
15 advertising?

16 So if you take the word "flamboyant" it may kind of
17 be too restrictive because somebody allows you the name of the
18 companies that are advertising. So I'm more inclined to
19 actually keep that word in there. And I'm -- I'm interested to
20 know what would -- why -- what was the logic for wanting to
21 take the word out?

22 MR. HOWE: Well, the rationale was that there is no
23 technical message, so it's flamboyant.

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: There's no definition for
25 advertising the California MUTCD or National MUTCD either.

1 MR. HOWE: I believe the language in the MUTCD in
2 general is you "shall not do advertising."

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Yeah.

4 MR. HOWE: But what this does is it provides
5 acknowledgment for --

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: No. But it doesn't -- it
7 doesn't --

8 MR. HOWE: -- entities that provide free-of-charge to
9 the state -- people of the State of California, that they'll go
10 out and pick up trash, they'll plant wildflowers, and there's a
11 variety thing as outlined in that.

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: And the only reason they
13 do that is for advertising. If they were doing it for pure
14 public good they wouldn't even want their name on those signs,
15 they would just do it. The fact that the company wants the
16 name on the sign on the highway is for advertising purpose, but
17 it's not a flamboyant form of advertising. It's not neon signs
18 and color and all that stuff. Otherwise, why would the -- if
19 the company is doing it with no advertising purpose they
20 wouldn't want the name on the sign to begin with.

21 So I think that I would still -- I think that the
22 feds on this one are right to put the word there to make sure
23 that we do not say that this is a pure public service with
24 no -- with no ulterior motive for advertising, because the
25 ultimate motive for the corporations are advertising when they

1 do these things. My two cents on that.

2 So I wouldn't be supporting taking the word
3 "flamboyant" out.

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER PRESLEIGH: Mr. Chairman, if I
5 may -- may make a comment. If you look right below that you do
6 acknowledge and entity or -- or company there. So I think it's
7 sort of already implied that you have the company name on
8 there. And, gee, I personally don't like the word flamboyant
9 because I don't think it has any technical merit, as well. But
10 you acknowledge the company in two below.

11 I guess I just -- I don't support -- I mean, I
12 support the removal of flamboyant. I just -- I think that's
13 the wrong word, or maybe we can come up with a better word,
14 significant advertisement or something.

15 CHAIR FISHER: Well, do we even need reference to
16 that statement at all? I mean, it says "the design should be
17 simple and dignified." What if we just kept that and said,
18 "Shall be simple and dignified and in general compliance with
19 other signs."

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: I mean, if you are
21 picking points, where is the definition of dignified, and who's
22 the arbiter on what is dignified, what's not dignified? But --
23 but what I'm saying is that we need to -- they put the word
24 there for a reason, to say that, okay, the only reason the
25 companies do this is purely advertising. There is no other

1 reason. But they just don't want it to be flamboyant so that
2 you don't give them half of the sign and they don't put like a
3 picture of the president there or stuff like that. Otherwise,
4 it's the only reason they do this advertising.

5 CHAIR FISHER: Okay. Any other comments or questions
6 for Mr. Howe?

7 If none, right now we'll go to public comment.

8 MR. MARSHALL: Thanks. I'm Rick Marshall with Napa
9 County, future member of the committee. And my comment is
10 along the same area you were just discussing. And when I
11 thought of it, it seemed a simple suggestion, but now I'm less
12 certain. The place where the proposal is to remove the word
13 "flamboyant," I was going to suggest the words "tendency
14 toward" also come out, because I think the -- the phrase
15 "devoid of any advertising" is more clear than "devoid of any
16 tendency toward advertising." That confused me. And it also
17 matches the language that's in the box in the left column. So
18 for your consideration.

19 CHAIR FISHER: Okay. Thank you. Any other members
20 of the public like to address this matter?

21 MR. PYBURN: Steve Pyburn, Federal Highway
22 Administration in California Division. Dignified is very
23 subjective, but that's language that we have.

24 The guidance in the other parts of the MUTCD prohibit
25 advertising on traffic control signs, all the signs in the --

1 in the book, except under very narrow limited cases. And I
2 think that the text tendency toward advertising is too far away
3 from the federal guidance of devoid of any advertising, which
4 is very explicit.

5 The -- on page 25, number 3, I don't see how the
6 proposed additions -- let me ask a question first. When was
7 the current California Code of Regulations adopted?

8 MR. HOWE: I don't know the exact date, but we've had
9 Adopt-A-Highway signs for probably -- well, for the -- the
10 whole time I've been here at Caltrans, since 1992. And I think
11 it probably goes back into the '80s.

12 MR. PYBURN:

13 MR. HOWE: I think that's as specific as I can answer
14 that question.

15 MR. PYBURN: The -- the reason why that's important
16 is the federal law allows you to change the standards of the
17 MUTCD to accommodate an existing federal law. And if this text
18 that's shown on the left was in the MUTCD prior to adoption of
19 the Code of Federal Regulations then you have to comply with it
20 or -- yeah. If the text was in before the Code of Federal
21 Regulations then you have to comply with the text. And I don't
22 see how the text in red complies with the standards on the
23 left.

24 So there is a timing issue to be addressed there,
25 which came first. If the -- if the MUTCD has a requirement and

1 a subsequent federal law -- I mean, I subsequent state law
2 comes along that would have you change the standard that's not
3 a reason we would find that standard to be in substantial
4 conformance if you changed the law after the MUTCD was written.

5
6 So it's -- the two points here, one, we -- I wouldn't
7 agree that allowing the domain name like Amazon.com is
8 consistent with the standard on the left that prohibits
9 Internet addresses, URL addresses, etcetera, which is dot
10 whatever, and the allowing of non-upper-case letters I don't
11 think is consistent with B either of the standard.

12 So the proposed text doesn't seem consistent with the
13 standard, but does the standard apply? It goes back to the
14 code of federal -- California code section was adopted in
15 relation to the MUTCD section. So I can't say for sure that
16 that's an acceptable change of that.

17 CHAIR FISHER: Any questions for Mr. Pyburn while
18 he's up there? Okay.

19 Are there any other members of the audience who want
20 to speak to this issue? If not, we'll return the discussion
21 back to the committee. And if Don Howe would be in the lead to
22 answer any questions.

23 MR. HOWE: Okay. Thank you, Steve, for your
24 comments. And I want to point out that in the new chapter that
25 is published here by the 2009 Federal MUTCD, the guidance given

1 right up front under "Acknowledgment Signs" says or states,
2 "A state of local agency that elects to have an
3 acknowledgment sign program should develop an
4 acknowledgment sign policy."

5 And what these things that we have proposed reflect,
6 the details of the state policy for Adopt-A-Highway.

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Mr. Chairman, I have a
8 question. How does the new policy or existing policy without
9 these changes affecting the existing Adopt-A-Highway signs? Do
10 we see some violating new standards if we don't change the
11 policy as you're stating or does this -- this just opening it
12 up to new companies that might have domain names as their
13 company names?

14 MR. HOWE: Since I don't administrate that program I
15 don't know. But I know that it was notable by the maintenance
16 person that I worked with for this proposal and these were the
17 changes that they suggested.

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: But I mean, were they were
19 concerned they'd have to remove some signs if we didn't make
20 these changes or are existing signs okay?

21 MR. HOWE: I don't know. I think they just wanted to
22 make things consistent with how the California Code of
23 Regulations reads and how they present their guidelines to
24 potential new Adopt-A-Highway customers.

25 SECRETARY SINGH: The bill was passed in 1985 for the

1 Adopt-A-Highway.

2 MR. HOWE: Okay. Thank you, Devinder.

3 SECRETARY SINGH: AB 2330. And we issued the policy
4 in 1989.

5 CHAIR FISHER: So, Don, after hearing a variety of
6 comments, do you want to propose any amendments to this? Do
7 you want us to go forward as proposed? Do you want to bring it
8 back to the committee?

9 MR. HOWE: Our intent was to get this change included
10 in the 2011 California MUTCD. And my proposal would be to
11 adopt the things as suggested. We -- we could make the request
12 on 3B read,

13 "Combining large and small upper-case or displaying all words
14 in all upper-case and some in upper- and lower-case not
15 permitted," we could break that off and make that a
16 support statement.

17 SECRETARY SINGH: Or standard. You can make standard
18 was --

19 CHAIR FISHER: You mean a standard?

20 SECRETARY SINGH: You can make standard, too. The
21 last sentence.

22 CHAIR FISHER: "Is not permitted" can not be -- I
23 mean, that would have to be a standard statement.

24 MR. HOWE: That would have to be a standard
25 statement.

1 SECRETARY SINGH: Move that to the standard.

2 CHAIR FISHER: "Shall not be permitted."

3 MR. HOWE: "Shall not be permitted."

4 CHAIR FISHER: Yeah.

5 MR. HOWE: Okay. So that would be one -- one

6 suggested -- that -- that -- that sentence would become its own

7 standard, because it is pretty -- it is pretty strongly worded.

8 And to me, "flamboyant," I believe I prefer the

9 existing language that we do show on the left column that has

10 been moved from Section 2D.48 to the new section, Section

11 2H.08. And we would strike not only "flamboyant" but "a

12 tendency toward flamboyant." We'd just have it read exactly as

13 it now reads "as devoid of any advertising."

14 CHAIR FISHER: Yes. So you would keep the current --

15 the current guidance language?

16 MR. HOWE: Yes.

17 CHAIR FISHER: Okay. What about on item number two,

18 would you keep that as it is or would you modify it?

19 MR. HOWE: I would keep it as it's proposed. I don't

20 believe there's any concerns expressed on item two.

21 CHAIR FISHER: What is a courtesy sign?

22 MR. HOWE: That's the name that our current policy

23 says that those recognition panels or acknowledgment panels are

24 called a courtesy sign.

25 CHAIR FISHER: Okay. So as I understand it you would

1 like to see a motion that proposes approval of what you
2 submitted with the following amendments, one, that we not adopt
3 new number one, and that we take 3B and split off the last
4 sentence to be a standard that will say "shall not be
5 permitted," and other than that you would like to see that and
6 move forward as it reads; is that correct?

7 MR. HOWE: That is correct, along with the request of
8 6F being deleted from the proposal altogether.

9 CHAIR FISHER: 6F being deleted?

10 MR. HOWE: Yes. We -- we would basically keep the
11 Adopt-A-Call Box sign because it's not really part of the
12 Caltrans Adopt-A-Highway program.

13 CHAIR FISHER: Yeah. So 6F would be deleted, 3B
14 would be modified so that the last portion is a standard
15 statement, and item one would remain as it currently is?

16 MR. HOWE: My friendly amendment was acknowledging
17 the comment made by the gentleman from Napa County. And that's
18 where I suggested we take "devoid of any" -- we would remove
19 "tendency toward flamboyant," and it would just read as it
20 currently reads in the 2010 MUTCD or says,

21 "On all such signs the design should be simple and
22 dignified, devoid of any advertising and in general
23 conformance with other guide signs."

24 CHAIR FISHER: Right. Keep -- keep the guidance
25 statement as it is; is that correct?

1 MR. HOWE: Yes.

2 CHAIR FISHER: Okay.

3 VICE CHAIR ROBINSON: Mr. Chairman?

4 CHAIR FISHER: Yes, Mr. Robinson?

5 VICE CHAIR ROBINSON: In -- in view of some of the

6 question that's been raised and the -- and the significant

7 modifications that we've talked about, I will remove my motion

8 to approve the original change, and then hopefully that will

9 simplify what additional action we take here.

10 I also would like to say that I'm not -- we -- I was

11 under the impression that Caltrans had been in communication

12 with FHWA on this and would have been -- would have had a

13 general agreement as to the changes. If that's not the case

14 then I'm no longer comfortable moving to approve as it is

15 currently stated. We still don't know from Mr. Pyburn if the

16 changes that we're talking about are -- are acceptable in their

17 eyes.

18 CHAIR FISHER: Okay. So we have no motion on the

19 floor.

20 VICE CHAIR ROBINSON: No motion.

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: At this point.

22 CHAIR FISHER: At this point. And I'd like to call

23 Steve up. Steve, if you could come forward. And just give

24 your comments on this.

25 If there were a motion it would be to retain item one

1 as it currently reads. Go forward with item 2. Go forward
2 with item 3A. Modify item 3B so that the last part reads as a
3 standard statement, "shall not permitted." And eliminate item
4 6F.

5 If that were the proposal would the FHWA have any
6 reservations about the item at this time?

7 MR. PYBURN: Well, the -- I think that two -- or one,
8 "a tendency toward," is irrelevant since advertising is
9 precluded as -- in general. I mean, you can -- you can put
10 that in there but there's a standard that says you can't have
11 advertising which --

12 CHAIR FISHER: Right. But the proposal is to keep
13 the federal language as it is on item number one.

14 MR. PYBURN: In 2 -- oh, on the left side?

15 CHAIR FISHER: Yes.

16 MR. PYBURN: Yeah, I can live with the federal
17 language.

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Mr. Chairman, on that
19 one --

20 SECRETARY SINGH: That's California MUTCD language.

21 CHAIR FISHER: Well, that's in the federal?

22 SECRETARY SINGH: No.

23 CHAIR FISHER: Okay.

24 MR. PYBURN: What -- what I would offer is to give
25 consideration to having the proposed changes in front, that

1 they can be dually considered.

2 MR. BHULLAR: Johnny Bhullar with Caltrans. Just for
3 clarity, since we are trying -- discussing it, both of these
4 languages are actually the MUTCD 2009 languages. The one on
5 the left that you see that's identified as 2010, section 3048,
6 that is still carried over in the new MUTCD 2009 but under
7 "General Information Signs." The other language that you see
8 on the right is the language also in the MUTCD 2009 edition.
9 That's under 2H.04, "Miscellaneous Information."

10 So both of these languages that you're looking at are
11 for different signs, but they are in the new MUTCD 2009.

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Mr. Chairman?

13 CHAIR FISHER: Hamid.

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Okay. You -- you have to
15 put into context. I don't want to belabor this, but if we go
16 with what you have, the California Caltrans Adopt-A-Highway
17 sign, they can not be installed period. Because if you read
18 it, it says,

19 "General information signs should not be installed within
20 a series of ground signs or other equally critical
21 locations unless there are specific reasons for orienting
22 the road users or identifying controlled points for
23 activities that are clearly in the public interest."

24 What public interest does it serve and what does it
25 orient the driver to know that Chevrolet of Rancho Cordova is

1 paying to clean the highway in this part? It is advertising.
2 So that's why I have a problem with it. If you go and say
3 "devoid of any advertising," any time that you put the name of
4 a private company on a road sign that does not give the driver
5 any additional information in terms of traffic control is
6 advertising.

7 What -- the -- the reason that I think they have
8 change it at the federal level is that it says "devoid of any
9 tendency toward flamboyant advertising." Because if you say
10 "devoid of advertising," the minute you put the name of a
11 company -- because read the sentence before that sentence. It
12 says that,

13 "There must be specific reasons for orienting the road
14 user or identifying controlled point for activities that
15 are clearly in public interest."

16 The driver doesn't need to know who's paying to clean
17 that section of highway. So that's why I have a problem with
18 it, that you may box yourselves into a corner that then your
19 whole signage on the Adopt-A-Highway Program may be challenged
20 because it's advertising. It's not flamboyant advertising but
21 it is advertising. So I feel a lot more comfortable with
22 the -- with the new language that the feds have.

23 SECRETARY SINGH: Don, why did you not keep that
24 2H.04 as shown? You know, what -- just keep -- leave that
25 language in, and case closed, and then everything else is okay.

1 CHAIR FISHER: I must admit, I got confused on the
2 format of this table. I thought with this little arrow you
3 have that this language on the right was replacing the language
4 on the left. That appears not to be the case.

5 MR. HOWE: Well, Johnny pointed out that the
6 information that's shown in the left-hand column is also in the
7 general guidance of "General Information Signs" for that
8 overall chapter, and that's a brand new chapter. But where do
9 you find that language today? Today you look in Chapter 2D,
10 Section 48, "General Information Signs," which at one time was
11 a section. Now it's all -- all -- all taken out and put in a
12 new chapter in the 2009 MUTCD. So that's what I referred back
13 to was the 2010 language.

14 CHAIR FISHER: Okay. Any further comments from
15 committee members? Jeff?

16 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Yeah. I'm actually
17 comfortable with what's being proposed in Section 1, because I
18 think my interpretation, unless I have this wrong, is it's
19 talking about critical locations. So if you're in a decision-
20 making location, like approaching an interchange or -- you
21 know, that would be more of a critical location. I usually see
22 these signs at very -- on the freeway it's hard to call it a
23 mid-block, but that they're in the middle of a long stretch
24 where no decisions are being made and there they're not in a
25 series of guide signs or -- or interfering with a motorists

1 judgment. So I think that that's all they were excluding, the
2 critical decision location.

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: What -- what public
4 interest to they serve?

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Well, they serve the
6 public interest of being an incentive to get outside funding
7 for highway maintenance, for highway roadside maintenance. So
8 that does serve the public's interest.

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: And the minute you put
10 the name of a private company on that sign --

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Good for them.

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: -- it becomes an
13 advertising sign.

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Good for them.

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: It becomes an advertising
16 sign.

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: It saves me -- the
18 taxpayer dollars.

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Absolutely. I have no
20 problem with it. But I'm saying let's call it for what it is,
21 this is advertising. It's not flamboyant advertising. I'm
22 glad that somebody at the federal level actually introduced
23 that language. Why are we trying to get rid of it?

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Well, no. This is in the
25 existing California MUTCD in a different section so that if

1 this existing language is getting us the signs we currently
2 have then it seems to be working. We don't need to fix it. We
3 just need to put it in the section that now applies to these
4 miscellaneous information signs.

5 CHAIR FISHER: Okay. Does anyone want to propose a
6 motion to move this item?

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Well, I would move to
8 approve the item as it's been amended, striking the -- the
9 changes in number 1, maintaining the changes proposed in number
10 2, making the changes shown in 3 except the second portion of
11 3D would be converted to a standard instead of an option,
12 taking the changes -- accepting the changes proposed in C and
13 as proposed in the rest of the document, except for eliminating
14 6F.

15 CHAIR FISHER: Okay. We have a motion. Do we have a
16 second? Do we have a second.

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: Okay. I'll second. I'll
18 second it to get a vote.

19 CHAIR FISHER: Wayne -- Wayne second's the motion.
20 Okay. Any further discussion on the motion?

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: I'm going to support the
22 motion. But I still think we don't need it, but it's not
23 really such a critical issue. But I said my piece. I'll
24 support the motion.

25 VICE CHAIR ROBINSON: Just -- just a question asking

1 for -- for confirmation that this is agreeable to FHWA, the
2 motion as it is worded.

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Well, he said they would
4 consider it. You didn't -- you didn't say -- he didn't give us
5 a no, but he said they'd have to consider it.

6 CHAIR FISHER: Steve never says yes in advance, I
7 found out. He says I already reserve the right to read the
8 file.

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Yeah. He said, you know,
10 full consideration.

11 CHAIR FISHER: Mr. Pyburn.

12 MR. PYBURN: Well, pending understanding what came
13 first, the federal regulation on the left or the California
14 Code of Regulations, that definitely puts it in the not
15 substantial conformance category or not. If the law was there
16 before this text on the left was put into federal standard then
17 some consideration can be made to allow you to change that
18 standard. If the law was there first then you -- you can. So
19 that's --

20 SECRETARY SINGH: The law was passed in 1985.

21 MR. PYBURN: And when was this text put in the
22 federal standard? Yeah, it's in the '09 MUTCD. So some
23 research to know which came first. Are you violating a
24 standard or not? That's the question I have to answer. So it
25 may go back to, I don't know, '83 and '89, whatever. It may

1 have appeared in 2009, and that's a different story. I would
2 expect that any language that said Internet address wasn't in
3 the '85 language, I mean, just off -- just as a guess.

4 MR. BHULLAR: Johnny Bhullar with Caltrans. The
5 Internet address was there before it was in the millennium
6 addition, and it could be prior to that. But at least in the
7 millennium addition is where it appeared, and that's where it
8 was clarified that Internet addresses can not be put on the
9 signs. I recall that part.

10 However, regarding the language that we are
11 proposing, is this included in the CCR of '85, the one that is
12 being proposed? Because that's what would be violating the
13 federal standard. So when we say "the entities that operate
14 exclusively on the Internet," is that language from the CCR?

15 MR. HOWE: My understanding is the current CCR as it
16 now exists. It may not have been --

17 MR. BHULLAR: Okay.

18 MR. HOWE: -- part of the 1989 that implemented the
19 program.

20 MR. BHULLAR: Okay.

21 CHAIR FISHER: Okay. So I guess the answer is Steve
22 would have to review the final language and come to a
23 determination as whether this would be in substantial
24 compliance.

25 We have a motion. We have a second. Do we have any

1 further discussion? We went to the audience.

2 But, Jacob, if you'd like to make a comment now
3 we'll -- we'll go back.

4 MR. BABICO: Thank you for allowing me. My name is
5 Jacob Babico from the County of San Bernardino.

6 I understand that you have some difficulties in
7 "devoid of any advertising." Well, if you drive Freeway 5 or
8 15 there are so many Shell stations, hamburger, Burger King on
9 these advertising signs. So what's the difference between
10 those? We're not having those in the Adopt-A-Highway.

11 CHAIR FISHER: Okay.

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Very good point.

13 CHAIR FISHER: I'd like to vote on the matter if
14 there are no further comments or discussion. Seeing none,
15 we'll go to a vote. All those in favor of the motion raise
16 your hand.

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: As amended.

18 CHAIR FISHER: As amended. Raise them high. Okay.
19 Unanimous. Thank you. All right.

20 We'll go to item 17. That's under Wayne, "Definition
21 of Standard and Engineering Judgment."

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: The next -- the next two
23 items are basically revisions to the 2009 Federal MUTCD. And
24 both of them, I think, are going to give us some relief.

25 Johnny Bhullar, he's -- he's a member of the national

1 committee, so he -- he's right on top of these things. And the
2 first one, 11-17, has to do with the definition of standards
3 and the use of engineering judgment, which I'm sure is critical
4 to -- to -- to California's adoption of these standards.

5 MR. BHULLAR: Johnny Bhullar with Caltrans.
6 Basically, both of the items are related, but I'll go through
7 them one at a time.

8 The first item, 11-17, basically here what we are
9 trying to do, our intention here is that there is a federal
10 proposal which is a Region 23 2009 manual. And hopefully every
11 one is aware of it. And our intent to bring this item on the
12 agenda is so that we can probably get a recommendation from the
13 committee that in case before the next meeting FHWA does make
14 this into an official region, and if it's very close to the way
15 they proposed it, there are no changes, at least we'd be
16 allowed to include that into the finalized California MUTCD
17 that we will be issuing. In case they do not, then, of course,
18 we can look at it.

19 But on this particular item there was a webinar a
20 couple of weeks ago from the feds, and I did participate. And
21 on purpose we did ask the question, because if you go to page
22 29 of 68, the language towards the bottom, there's a sentence
23 that says, "Standard statements shall not be modified or
24 compromised based on engineering judgment or engineering
25 study." And as most of you are familiar, and we have discussed

1 this issue, it does pose liability issues for agencies.

2 So checking with the feds, Harry Cull (phonetic), the
3 MUTCD team leader, and going on the record and asking the
4 question that in case this region dose not become official then
5 we do want to delete this particular standard sentence out of
6 the manual. And he did say that since this was issued this
7 proposed region is being issued as a clarification, even in the
8 2009 when they added this language it was clarifying the 2003
9 which did not include the sentence, it will be perfectly okay
10 for us to delete this sentence in case they do not make this an
11 official region.

12 So what we are asking the committee is that this
13 proposed region, if it does become official before the next
14 meeting we be given the go ahead, at least, to incorporate it
15 since we won't have time to come back to the committee and seek
16 an official recommendation.

17 CHAIR FISHER: When is the deadline date by which the
18 feds expect to make a decision on this?

19 MR. BHULLAR: The feds have no commitments on the
20 date because it's a proposed revision. And their final -- the
21 final comments are due by October 30th or, I believe, the 31st.

22 SECRETARY SINGH: The 31st.

23 MR. BHULLAR: Yeah. But then after that there is no
24 commitment on their part. And I did ask that question as to
25 when they will be issuing an official region.

1 Caltrans has -- under Wayne's signature we have sent
2 a letter to the feds, as well as added comments through -- we
3 have provided comments to the feds encouraging them to issue
4 this as an official region before January 15th so that at least
5 we don't have to very quickly thereafter change our newly
6 released memo.

7 CHAIR FISHER: So my understanding is if they reach a
8 decision before January 15th you'll incorporate that into the
9 California MUTCD to reflect that language. If it's after
10 January 15th then it will not make the new California MUTCD; is
11 that correct?

12 MR. BHULLAR: Yes, except that even in that case we
13 want to delete this one sentence, the "shall" sentence that's
14 shown in red. And we have checked with FHWA and they have said
15 that will be okay for us to do.

16 SECRETARY SINGH: They said we can keep 2003
17 language.

18 MR. BHULLAR: Yeah.

19 CHAIR FISHER: So --

20 MR. BHULLAR: So in that case all we will do is
21 delete that sentence.

22 CHAIR FISHER: No. That sentence, I don't see it.
23 Where is the language?

24 MR. BHULLAR: On page 29.

25 CHAIR FISHER: On 29. Okay.

1 MR. BHULLAR: Towards the bottom.

2 CHAIR FISHER: Okay. Okay.

3 MR. BHULLAR: In that case, if the feds do not issue
4 an official region then all we are going to do is strike out
5 that one sentence, and that's the recommendation we're seeking
6 from the committee under this item. In case they make it an
7 official region and they do add the two paragraphs that are
8 shown above, which are paragraph 3 and paragraph 4 on the same
9 page, 29, then we will be adding those, as well. And that's
10 the recommendation we're seeking from the committee here.

11 CHAIR FISHER: Okay.

12 MR. BHULLAR: In case they show an official region
13 that is markedly different from what is being shown here then,
14 of course, we will bring it back to the committee, because we
15 don't want to seek a blanket or recommendation from the
16 committee which we are not even clear on what that might be, in
17 case it's different from the proposal.

18 CHAIR FISHER: Okay. So that's item 11-17?

19 MR. BHULLAR: That's correct.

20 CHAIR FISHER: Do we have any further questions of
21 Johnny? Seeing none, do we have any comments from members in
22 the audience? Going once. Going twice. Okay.

23 We bring it back to the committee then. Do we have a
24 motion to approve what's been proposed for item number 11-17?

25 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: I'll make that motion.

1 CHAIR FISHER: Okay.

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Second.

3 CHAIR FISHER: Moved by Wayne. Seconded by who? By
4 Jeff. Any further discussion on the matter? Jeff?

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: I just simply want to
6 thank Caltrans for taking the lead on this issue because that
7 was -- I think -- I hope that that gets struck from the
8 standard language.

9 CHAIR FISHER: Okay. Any final discussion? Let's
10 vote on the matter. All those in favor of the item -- I'm
11 sorry. Mike?

12 VICE CHAIR ROBINSON: I'm ready.

13 CHAIR FISHER: Oh. Okay. You're ready to vote.

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: He's eager to vote.

15 CHAIR FISHER: I was going to take a voice vote on
16 this one. All those in favor of the item say aye. Opposed?
17 Abstentions? It carries unanimously.

18 Thank you, Johnny.

19 We have kind of a related item, item number 11-18.
20 That relates to compliance dates.

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: Yes. The secretary of
22 transportation, you know, went around after the MUTCD came out
23 and got an earful about the compliance states and the economy.
24 And so they proposed, you know, relaxing a lot of the
25 compliance states. And Johnny will go into the details.

1 CHAIR FISHER: Yes, Johnny.

2 MR. BHULLAR: Johnny Bhullar with Caltrans. Again,
3 on this item, which is from the same line or at least on a
4 similar line that we discussed previously, this is a second
5 proposed region from the feds on their 2009 MUTCD that we are
6 considering for adoption. Since this is a proposed change,
7 again, we have made similar comments to the feds and we have
8 made a similar request asking them that we be allowed at least
9 to -- in case the feds make this as an official region, we'd be
10 allowed to incorporate that into the final MUTCD 2012 when we
11 release it so that it can be incorporated.

12 However, they have not committed to any dates as to
13 when they're making this as an official region. And of course,
14 from our side there is no urgency. Of course, in case they can
15 do it before January 15th then we do want to adopt it so that
16 we don't continue changing our manual very quickly thereafter.
17 But if there is going to be a change from their proposal then
18 we'll bring it to the next meeting. But if they take official
19 action before that and it's very close to the proposal then we
20 seek the committee here to look at it and give us a
21 recommendation to go ahead and incorporate it into the -- when
22 they issue a new memo.

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: I have a question, Mr.
24 Chairman.

25 CHAIR FISHER: Hamid.

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Johnny, I've been asked
2 this question by a few agencies, what the secretary is
3 proposing does not affect the requirement for compliance for
4 the retroactivity, that two years, it still stands?

5 MR. BHULLAR: Okay. Johnny Bhullar with Caltrans.
6 The question regarding the retroactivity date, yes, there is a
7 proposal. And this proposal does revise the retroactivity
8 dates. The only thing it doesn't revise -- actually, it
9 revises all four aspects of the retroactivity date, the first
10 aspect being the having a method. So the method, that date is
11 being extended by two years. And rather than, I believe it was
12 January 1st, 2012, it's going to be now two more years from the
13 date when this becomes official. So it could be even more than
14 two years. So when they make this change official, from that
15 date, two more years.

16 But the other three regarding the regulatory warning
17 sign dates, the street name signs and the guide signs, those
18 dates are being deleted. That's the proposal.

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: But they're all gone. So
20 the three year -- because have they finished their rule-making
21 comment process now or are they still in the comment process?

22 MR. BHULLAR: Okay. I do want to make --

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Because I thought they
24 had like 90-days comment period of --

25 MR. BHULLAR: Yeah. I want to make it clear, on --

1 on previous item, actually, I misspoke. On that one, the
2 deadline for their comments was October 3rd. On this one it's
3 October 31st. It's right now still open for public --

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: So --

5 MR. BHULLAR: -- review and comment.

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: So --

7 MR. BHULLAR: And --

8 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: -- after that there comes
9 a time that sometime, maybe in January or February, whenever
10 the FHWA issues the rule, the final rule on that, so the two
11 year compliance starts from that point?

12 MR. BHULLAR: Yes, just for the method.

13 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Yeah, just for the
14 method.

15 MR. BHULLAR: Just for the method. They -- when they
16 make it official, from the date they make it official there is
17 a 30-day period when it becomes effective.

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Okay.

19 MR. BHULLAR: So first we have to make it official.
20 From that day, 30 days for it to take effect. And from that
21 effective date, two years.

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: So that's pretty much
23 going to be the only thing that's still going to have a
24 deadline?

25 MR. BHULLAR: That's it.

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Everything else is pretty
2 much --

3 MR. BHULLAR: Already reflected.

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Yeah.

5 MR. BHULLAR: Yes.

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Everything else as far as
7 times and all that is pretty much --

8 MR. BHULLAR: Yeah.

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: -- going to go and it's
10 going to be lifetime, whenever you replace?

11 MR. BHULLAR: End of useful service life.

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: End of --

13 MR. BHULLAR: Yeah.

14 CHAIR FISHER: Johnny, I had a question for you. In
15 California we generally have moved away from strict compliance
16 dates and stated in effect that whenever you have a project or
17 you have systematic upgrading, or with maintenance, you change
18 to the new standard at that time, rather than have a strict
19 compliance deadline date. So would this really change anything
20 in California?

21 MR. BHULLAR: Well, you mean the proposed change?

22 CHAIR FISHER: Yes.

23 MR. BHULLAR: Yes, it will, because basically as --
24 as the way the memo is interpreted right now is that most of
25 the dates previously, when we got -- when we adopted the MUTCD

1 for the first time, we got grandfathered in by deleting all
2 those compliance dates. However, any new dates that were being
3 applied in the 2009 manual, they were going to become
4 applicable to California. For example, like the -- actually,
5 that one is still going to stay, so that's a wrong example.
6 But there are, out of 58 dates that the feds have right now in
7 the 2009 manual that we are adopting, there are 44 dates out
8 of those 58 that they are going to be deleted. And out of
9 those there are like nine or ten that came in with the 2009.

10 Actually, there's a good example, is the arrow that
11 has to be right in the middle of the -- approximately in the
12 middle of the guide signs, that was a date that the feds have
13 for -- in the 2009 right now, and I believe the date is
14 January -- January 2019. So, for example, for Caltrans, on all
15 our guide signs, wherever we have an overhead sign with an
16 arrow that arrow shall approximately be in the middle of the
17 lane. It can not be pointed. So it has to be overhead. And
18 now, with this proposal, that date is going to be going away.

19 CHAIR FISHER: Well, what -- so in California would
20 that have been a strict deadline date --

21 MR. BHULLAR: Yes.

22 CHAIR FISHER: -- or would it have been when you
23 maintain?

24 MR. BHULLAR: No. That would have been a strict
25 deadline date because any 2009, the new dates that came in,

1 that would have been applicable to California because we just
2 got -- one time FHWA California division office, one time they
3 gave us a grandfathering clause by saying since the previous
4 dates for other states, they had a lot of time to work on those
5 dates, so one time we were able to delete all those compliance
6 dates. However, any new dates that come in, every time we are
7 going to be having them applicable to California, we can not
8 have those dates be deleted.

9 CHAIR FISHER: Okay.

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Mr. Chairman?

11 CHAIR FISHER: Hamid?

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Just a footnote on that,
13 I think in retrospect, not even in retrospect, even in those
14 days I think this organization made the comment that it was an
15 extremely poor decision by the Department of Transportation
16 to -- to have all these artificial deadlines that really have
17 no safety value for the public whatsoever. They're just
18 artificial deadlines they came up with and said change this
19 sign and change that sign.

20 But those, I think the trigger point was when City of
21 New York found out that they have to spend \$23 million on their
22 street name signs. And then they went to the feds and they
23 said why are you forcing us to spend \$23 million dollars on
24 changing the street name signs that are perfectly fine when you
25 have so much -- so many potholes and so many broken sidewalks.

1 So I think that was the trigger point. Then the secretary
2 backed down and said, okay, let's change the signs whenever you
3 change --

4 MR. BHULLAR: Since you talk about it, a little bit
5 of background here. Yes, you're right, that the media on the
6 East Coast, when they started picking this up, and then the
7 lawmakers heard about it and made it to congress, and that's
8 why this particular region, the item that we are looking at
9 right now, actually came out as a release from the White House
10 when they said we are going to provide relief.

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Yeah.

12 MR. BHULLAR: So the president is taking credit for
13 those, so that's how it's going to adopt.

14 CHAIR FISHER: Johnny, what happens if the feds do
15 not have a final determination by January 15th?

16 MR. BHULLAR: Okay. If they do not have a final
17 determination by 2015 then some of the new dates that they have
18 proposed in the 2009 and that I have as shown in my final
19 draft -- and if need be I can bring that up -- will become
20 applicable to California. But since those dates are in the
21 future, well, we can still be okay with having those dates.
22 But they will become applicable to California until and as such
23 time when the feds are wise or make it official change.

24 CHAIR FISHER: Okay. Thank you. Okay. Well, that's
25 the presentation of the item. Any further questions of Johnny

1 on this?

2 And, Mr. Secretary, did we go to members of the
3 audience on this one?

4 SECRETARY SINGH: Yes. Yes.

5 CHAIR FISHER: We did. Okay. All right.

6 MR. BHULLAR: Well, just -- I do want to add one
7 clarification. I attended a webinar in which they did point
8 out that after 58 compliance date, 44 are being thrown out and
9 two are being like revised. So we will still have these about
10 12 dates that we will be held to. So --

11 CHAIR FISHER: Okay. Bill, did you want to make a
12 comment?

13 MR. WINTER: Yes. Bill Winter, Los Angeles County
14 Department of Public Works.

15 I have no problem with this item that Caltrans has.
16 But I think I just want to again bring it clearly to the
17 committee's attention, and I want to ask that we all try to do
18 whatever we can to get it out to the local agencies out there,
19 that there are still at least two very demanding and costly
20 mandates here that the -- one of them is the "one-Way" signs
21 requirements -- I'm looking on page 35 of 68 -- the "one-Way"
22 sign requirements for certain divided highways, as I understand
23 it. And I think I brought this up to the committee's attention
24 at a workshop, that I believe this came out of the older driver
25 studies that were done, the same study, I think, that came up

1 with the street name sign requirement that the larger font size
2 be used.

3 So this -- this could have very broad economic
4 implications for local agencies. And so they still do have the
5 opportunity here by October 31st to get those kind of concerns
6 into the federal register if -- if there are any. And I know
7 my agency, we -- we intend to comment on -- on that particular
8 matter.

9 And -- and the other one which also is going to prove
10 very costly is the horizontal alignment warning sign
11 requirement. That, I believe, came out of other technical
12 studies and definitely has some safety merit from what those
13 studies were saying. But again, it's more of a planning thing
14 maybe for agencies that would want to know how they'd have to
15 go about implementing that new type of sign regimen on
16 horizontal curves.

17 So just anything that we can all do to make sure
18 comments are received and into the federal register by October
19 31st on those.

20 CHAIR FISHER: Thank you, Bill.

21 Any further comments from those members in the
22 public -- in the audience? Okay.

23 Hearing none, we'll close that part of the session
24 and we'll bring the matter back to the committee. Do we have a
25 motion to move on this item?

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: I'd make a motion that we
2 move on the item.

3 CHAIR FISHER: Okay. Do we have a second?

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER PRESLEIGH: Second.

5 CHAIR FISHER: John Presleigh, second. Any further
6 discussion on the matter?

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Mr. Chairman, is
8 Caltrans, following what Mr. Winter said, is Caltrans sending
9 comments asking for relief on those two deadlines also for the
10 State of California? Then it becomes national if all the
11 states ask.

12 MR. BHULLAR: Johnny Bhullar with Caltrans.
13 Actually, we have just made overall comment which is that we
14 want the feds to just act quickly. But on purpose we are not
15 making comments, for example, like for the -- for the
16 horizontal alignment signs. Our safety program has already
17 given -- accepted that, that that's the direction we are
18 heading, and we have already started a program to identify and
19 move in that direction. So --

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: But -- but you had
21 said -- yeah, but you are -- you are doing for Caltrans.

22 MR. BHULLAR: Yes.

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: This has implication on
24 all the local levels. So should Caltrans be asking for relief
25 of all these deadlines for the State of California because of

1 the other competing priorities that are in the transportation
2 system, that you don't want people to go and change perfectly
3 fine signs because somebody decided that the six-inch letter is
4 better than the two-inch letter?

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: We supported the, you know,
6 the direction that the FHWA was going. You know, I don't think
7 we got into -- in fact, I know we didn't get into the specific
8 signs and the specific deadlines.

9 MR. BHULLAR: Well, I do remember discussing it in-
10 house with our Office of Traffic Safety. And the tone of
11 Caltrans is that we do not want to argue with the CHP and the
12 research behind these -- some of these recommendations. So we
13 are going to begin our implementation process.

14 CHAIR FISHER: Okay. I just need to stand up for a
15 moment.

16 Any further questions of Johnny? Okay.

17 We have a motion. It's been seconded. Any further
18 comments? Jeff?

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: I just wanted to agree
20 with the engineer from L.A. County, that these are going to be
21 quite expensive. My understanding is this calls for 15-mile-
22 an-hour curve warning signs at all of our local street knuckle
23 curves. So, like I've already told some residents, contact me
24 in six months with their request because I won't be able to say
25 no.

1 But -- so it is a burden on the local cities that I
2 represent, including my own. And -- but I don't see a way of
3 really challenging this, but it's good to put in the record for
4 other cities that, you know, the "One-Way" signs or all of the
5 "Keep Right" signs that have to be added at every median
6 opening and --

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Yeah. There is -- there
8 is a way to challenge. Because the feds are in the rule-making
9 process.

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Right.

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: And there is a public
12 comment.

13 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: But there's nothing he
14 would be saying that isn't already in the register --

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Yeah. No, no.

16 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: -- from multiple agencies.

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: But what I'm saying that
18 if they hear from 1,000 cities across the United States it's
19 going to influence the decision.

20 MR. BHULLAR: So basically it's not only to the item,
21 like you're saying. It's up to the cities and the counties to
22 write to the FHWA. What we're asking, if this thing becomes
23 final we can include it in the California MUTCD. So there are
24 two different issues.

25 CHAIR FISHER: And keep in mind, this only changes

1 the date of compliance. It doesn't change the requirement to
2 comply.

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Those were my only -- my
4 only comments.

5 CHAIR FISHER: Okay. Any further comments from
6 committee members? Seeing none, I'd like to bring this matter
7 to a vote. All of those in favor of the item say aye?

8 ALL COMMITTEE MEMBERS: Aye.

9 CHAIR FISHER: Any nos or abstentions? The item
10 carries unanimously. Thank you. Okay.

11 It's 12:40. We had a goal of trying to complete our
12 agenda by 2:30. We have two large items, and a request for
13 experimentation.

14 I'd like to go next to item 11-14 which is a change
15 in the CTCDC bylaws. We'll try to gauge out time and see how
16 quickly we can move through this one.

17 Wayne --

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: Okay.

19 CHAIR FISHER: -- would you like to take the lead on
20 this?

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: At the last meeting I
22 presented a letter that came from the director of Caltrans
23 saying that he wanted two more -- two additional members on the
24 CTCDC that represented non-motorized users of the highway
25 system. And at that meeting we basically agreed to come back

1 with the proposed changes to the bylaws. And since that time I
2 have circulated the -- the, you know, the old bylaws to all the
3 members and to some of the stakeholders. And we have come up
4 with proposed changes to implement the addition of two members.

5 That's basically what we're here to discuss is
6 these -- you know, the changes to the bylaws. And we can just
7 go right through the -- right through the -- the bylaws, if
8 you'd like. On Article II in red there I basically just added,
9 in addition to 21400 which, you know, governs the fact that,
10 you know, Caltrans will consult with local agencies, we have
11 section 653202 -- or 65 -- 65302(b) that specifies that we have
12 to take into consideration the needs of all users, and therein
13 lies the motivation for adding additional members.

14 On Chapter C, instead of specifying all the control
15 agencies we just thought that we'd mention stakeholders, which
16 again the stakeholders includes the representatives of all
17 highway users. Okay.

18 In Paragraph D we added the language that basically
19 we're responsible for serving as a forum to review and evaluate
20 proposals of agencies concerned with traffic control devices.
21 I think, you know, some people may think that we have more to
22 do than just traffic control devices. But this -- this group
23 here is basically giving Caltrans advice on traffic control
24 devices. We don't institute any programs of -- of any kind as
25 far as transportation programs.

1 Part C --

2 SECRETARY SINGH: E. E. Part E.

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: E, I'm sorry. Yeah. I
4 need my glasses. Basically we're -- we changed the language a
5 little bit to -- to represent the fact that -- you know, who
6 we're going to keep in the information loop. And we eliminated
7 Part F --

8 SECRETARY SINGH: F moved into one.

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: Yeah. F moved into one.
10 And then -- okay. Part G, we just basically reflect the fact
11 that we're talking about the California Manual on Uniform
12 Traffic Control Devices, which is basically what we're -- the
13 product of our deliberations. And then finally just expanded
14 the -- the -- this group is helping us with interpreting the
15 FHWA manual. Okay.

16 Going into Article III, Membership and Organization,
17 that's where we reflect the fact that the director Caltrans,
18 instead of just appointing one representative which is me,
19 we'll now appoint three representatives, two of which will be
20 non-motorized, you know, represent non-motorized users of the
21 highway system.

22 We have published the criteria that we'll be using to
23 select those members, and those -- they're on our Internet
24 website. And since -- okay.

25 And then going into practices, since we're gone from

1 eight members to ten member we had to decide what would be a
2 quorum. And so it used to be that we'd have to get six votes
3 on the committee to get any, you know, any formal
4 recommendations to Caltrans. Now we've gone up to seven. So
5 we've dropped from 75 percent down to --

6 SECRETARY SINGH: Seventy percent.

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: -- yeah, 70 percent.

8 We've added a little more clarity, too, as far as the
9 management of the committee goes. And that sort of just -- no
10 change in practice. It's just making a little more clarity.

11 And we -- on the -- again, in the procedures section
12 we talked about, you know, we just formalized the fact that
13 we -- we move between Northern California and Southern
14 California.

15 And then finally, if a delegate, any of us meet --
16 miss more than three meetings we'll be going back to the parent
17 organizations to see if we can, you know, get a more -- get a
18 more active, you know, representation. Up to this point that
19 hasn't really been an issue, but at least there was a concern.
20 So that issue is covered.

21 So that's just about all the changes we've made to
22 reflect the fact that we've added to additional members. And
23 the rest of the changes would just add clarification.

24 CHAIR FISHER: Okay. Thank you for that, Wayne.

25 In discussing it I'd like to kind of break up the

1 discussion in two parts. I think the more lively discussion
2 might be on the number of members that Caltrans may designate.

3 But I'd like to put that aside and just have a
4 discussion right now on the other factors which generally
5 reflect the past practice of the committee or are kind of
6 technical in nature. So let's put the more controversial
7 matter aside for the moment.

8 Are there any comments, discussion, concerns about
9 the other portions that are shown in red here?

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Yeah. Mr. Chairman --

11 CHAIR FISHER: Hamid.

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: -- on that, on page 52,
13 the second paragraph, this has not been an issue with the
14 committee, but some people anticipate it may become an issue.
15 And I think it's a good safeguard, but I suggest that three
16 consecutive meetings be changed to two consecutive meetings.
17 Because there are years, the last year and this year, where
18 like when we are going through the -- the MUTCD adoption and
19 changes we usually have maybe sometimes four meetings. But in
20 regular years we typically have three meetings. And if you're
21 saying that you miss three consecutive meetings it's like a
22 person not attending any committee meeting for a whole year.
23 And I don't think it's going to serve the committee to have
24 members who -- who are not going to be here.

25 So I suggest that if -- if we want to have a

1 safeguard to make the committee -- because as we all know, the
2 committee discussions are more collegial and more productive
3 when there is continuity and when members have a history of the
4 previous discussions. Otherwise we are going to rehash all the
5 discussions every single meeting all over. So I suggest that
6 we change that three consecutive meetings to two consecutive
7 meetings, and three of the most recent six meetings I would --
8 I wouldn't even bother with that. But I would just say that
9 you miss two consecutive meetings you probably are not
10 interested in serving on the committee and you probably need to
11 make room for someone who has the time and resources to serve.

12 CHAIR FISHER: Okay. Thank you. Any other comments
13 from committee members regarding all the items shown, with the
14 exception of Article III changes?

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER KELLER: Mr. Chairman?

16 CHAIR FISHER: Yes, John?

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER KELLER: Under Article II, the new
18 requirement to take into account the needs of all users for the
19 government code, is that part of the second discussion?

20 CHAIR FISHER: Yes. I'll consider that part of the
21 second discussion. Thank you for that.

22 Mr. Knowles.

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Well, I'm concerned about
24 Hamid's comments. I can -- until recently I would have
25 probably said exactly what he said. But I -- I face a

1 situation where I might have to miss a number of meetings. And
2 it seems to me that in terms of Caltrans interests and -- and
3 somebody doing due diligence to make sure they're representing
4 their agency, I mean, what we're trying to avoid, I would
5 think, would be vacant seats.

6 But if the delegate and the alternate have clearly
7 discussed the matter and made sure there was coverage, in my
8 case for the League of California Cities northern portion, I
9 don't -- I don't know that I would necessarily kick the
10 representative off the committee even though they -- because
11 they did do due diligence to make sure a representative was
12 present, even whether it's financial reasons with city budgets
13 being what they are right now, with -- you know, people might
14 want to divide up certain duties as we're traveling north and
15 south, or as we've just had these very heavy workshops, three-
16 day workshops that called for us to be out of the city. I've
17 got a general plan update going on right now. So I wouldn't go
18 to two.

19 I can understand the concern that there's just no-
20 shows from certain agencies. But I guess I wouldn't support
21 changing that to two.

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: The only -- the only
23 reason I'm bringing it up is that as you so rightfully said,
24 until now all the representatives on the committee represent
25 entities, organizations. You are representing California

1 League of Cities. I'm representing AAA. So if you are not
2 available your alternate can talk with the agency, with the
3 parent organization that has made the appointment for both of
4 you, because you are not speaking your mind, I'm not speaking
5 my mind. We are representing agencies that have appointed us.

6 But now we are trekking into new territories. We are
7 going to have members who are going to be appointed, speaking
8 for no one but themselves. Even though they're appointed by
9 the Caltrans director they are not Caltrans employees, as the
10 other appointment of Caltrans has always been. They are
11 individuals that are picked by Caltrans director, and they have
12 no connection to any other organization. They -- they are
13 individuals with -- with driving interest qualifications.

14 CHAIR FISHER: Well, that's part of the second
15 discussion.

16 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Yeah.

17 CHAIR FISHER: Okay.

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: So -- so if that
19 individual -- if that individual is not present that individual
20 and his alternate may not even be talking with each other.
21 They may not know each other. So if that individual is not
22 coming to the meetings that's my concern is that -- you know,
23 that's the only reason I'm bringing it up. The reason we have
24 not had such a need in the bylaws so far is exactly because we
25 all represent agencies and entities. Now if we are going to

1 have public members then we need to have some kind of minimum
2 requirement for attendance, otherwise you're going to have just
3 a membership parked in the committee which is not really
4 helping the interest that you are supposed to serve.

5 CHAIR FISHER: And I will point out that --

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: That's the only reason.

7 CHAIR FISHER: -- that's been an issue in the past
8 with the Northern California representative of AAA. The
9 primary member was Mary Banks.

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Yeah.

11 CHAIR FISHER: And she had delegated that very often
12 to --

13 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Sure.

14 CHAIR FISHER: -- Deborah, and I think more than
15 three times in a row.

16 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Yeah. But either Mary or
17 Deborah, either me or my alternate, whichever one comes here,
18 he or she does not speak for himself. He or she speaks for the
19 organization that he represents, so it doesn't matter who
20 comes, the primary or the alternate.

21 But for the very first time we are introducing two
22 members who are not representing any organization. They are
23 individuals.

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Yeah. But there's just --
25 there's not two sets of rules here. So as John cited, or even

1 how I came onto the committee, my voting member had -- had
2 health concerns. I was filling in. But I wouldn't have wanted
3 to give him the boot just because he couldn't make some
4 meetings for legitimate meetings.

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Three meetings is one
6 year.

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Well, it's -- it's
8 still -- things come up, even during just the period of time
9 when we schedule these meeting that that person -- I
10 understand, the seat needs to be filled. The organization
11 needs to be -- needs to have somebody speaking for it. I'm
12 hoping when Caltrans makes their selections they take this into
13 consideration. But that's -- this is kind of part two of the
14 discussion.

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: You know, the people we
16 select are going to go through a lot of scrutiny. And then --
17 and part of it is how well -- how plugged in are they to the,
18 you know, the people they represent. And so -- and again, if
19 they're -- if they're not doing an adequate job the director of
20 Caltrans will say, well, maybe somebody else can. Because I
21 think, you know, it's the director of Caltrans prerogative.
22 It's like we don't decide who from CSAC or the League or, you
23 know, how -- even how they're selected, you know, what
24 criteria, you know, the -- the parent organizations use.

25 CHAIR FISHER: Okay. Any further comments on those

1 things not related to the added members of the committee?

2 MR. WINTER: Just a public comment.

3 CHAIR FISHER: No further comment at the table?

4 We'll go -- now go to the public comment period.

5 MR. WINTER: Again, Bill Winter, L.A. County Public
6 Works. And just on the -- how you have broken this up to -- to
7 focus, I guess, on the first part, I had submitted, and I --
8 unfortunately, I think it was late to Devinder, a comment just
9 on this attendance issue. My suggestion there was that the
10 secretary of the committee inform the parent organization if
11 there is an attendance threshold that is being crossed. And
12 then it's up to the parent organization to decide if that
13 person, either the delegate of the alternate delegate or -- or
14 the seat, actually, however the seat is being filled, if that
15 should be something changed by the -- the parent organization.
16 I didn't see that as something that -- you can maybe prescribe
17 the threshold in the bylaws, but it's really the secretary's --
18 my suggestion was the secretary's duty to tell the parent
19 organization to make that change.

20 If Caltrans is looking to bring on other members,
21 public members, it seems like that's just a minimum requirement
22 of the position that's an expectation that they could voice to
23 the public member of you need to be at meetings a certain
24 number of times, otherwise, you know, they -- they would look
25 to make that change. So just for consideration on that.

1 CHAIR FISHER: Are there any other members of the
2 audience here who would like to comment on the first part of
3 the discussion? If you're going to have any comment on it
4 please go to the podium now. If not, we'll close the public
5 comment period and bring this matter back to the committee.

6 Are there any further comments on the first part of
7 the discussion?

8 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Just -- just if I make
9 one more comment?

10 CHAIR FISHER: Hamid?

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: It's actually more of a
12 question for Caltrans, it's on top of page 52. On top of page
13 52, the line where -- and again, I'm thinking about your
14 overall budget situation, where you are saying the consecutive
15 meeting locations should be alternated between -- alternated
16 between Northern and Southern California, there might come a
17 time, I hope not, that you may need to have two, three meetings
18 consecutive in Sacramento for budgetary reasons. So do we want
19 to make it such a strong statement that meetings should
20 alternate between north and south? Do you see the flexibility
21 having the staff moving back and forth?

22 SECRETARY SINGH: So we can discuss with the
23 committee members if -- if they believe it is.

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Because -- because we are
25 adding that language. We never had that language before.

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: Yeah, I know. I don't know
2 why, you know, it's never --

3 CHAIR FISHER: You mean it reflects past practice?

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Right.

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Yeah.

6 CHAIR FISHER: Yeah.

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: Yeah. I think that's
8 what -- this reflects past practice.

9 CHAIR FISHER: Dwight, did you have a comment?

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER KU: Yes. I wanted to just make my
11 own comment regarding missing of meetings. Just some -- a
12 thought came to mind with Hamid's last comment. If the
13 director is going to appoint based upon categories perhaps
14 those categories could be viewed as entities.

15 And to address an earlier concern, perhaps -- perhaps
16 missing of meetings, whether it's two or three or one and
17 whether or not they're consecutive could be upon the entity so
18 that the entity would lose representation if that entity fails
19 to attend X number of consecutive meetings. So you know,
20 then -- then someone who has exigent circumstances, medical
21 problems that requires an extended absence from the committee,
22 but there's an alternate to speak on behalf of that group or
23 entity, then the purpose for the -- the purpose for which that
24 person has been selected to serve on the committee would not
25 have been left void.

1 So anyway, I think that may be another approach to
2 that. And so perhaps the language on page 52 is not so much
3 delegate as it is an entity or the parent organization. So
4 that may solve one of the problems that we were talking about.

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: That is -- Mr. Chairman?

6 CHAIR FISHER: Yes, Hamid.

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: That is an excellent
8 suggestion from Dwight. The only thing is what happens with
9 the two new members? They are not entities. They're
10 appointments by Caltrans director individuals.

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER KU: Yeah. That -- I guess that's
12 what I was trying to get at is even though they're not an
13 entity they're in a category that the director is -- has
14 designated. And so if it's a non-motorized user, and non-
15 motorized users miss whatever the agreed upon number of
16 consecutive meetings then that particular group -- not that
17 the -- not that that particular interest has never been
18 represented on this committee. But you know, that seat at
19 the -- at the committee would then be lost at that point.

20 If there's no one -- if the person designated an
21 alternate doesn't have enough interest to come to X number of
22 consecutive meetings then, you know, the interest will still be
23 considered, whether it's someone on the committee or someone
24 who attends the meeting. But it's just that it won't -- we
25 won't have that quorum or voting issue to have to deal with.

1 CHAIR FISHER: Okay. Any further comments on part
2 one of this discussion?

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: Well, you know -- you know,
4 I -- the delegates and whether they continue to serve or not is
5 probably really the business of the -- of the parent
6 organization. And whether it's AAA or Caltrans, if Caltrans
7 decides that they're not be well -- you know, the -- let's say,
8 for example, the non-motorized folks aren't showing up then
9 Caltrans will make that decision, or maybe they do have
10 alternates, and they may even have a formal agreement to -- to
11 alternate alternates. I hope not. But, I mean, that could
12 happen.

13 CHAIR FISHER: Mike.

14 VICE CHAIR ROBINSON: This committee has been around
15 for a long time. And that really hasn't proven -- the
16 attendance hasn't proven to be a problem that I'm aware of up
17 to this point. And I don't know that it's reasonable that we
18 anticipate that coming up.

19 Personally, I'm -- I'm okay with -- with the
20 recommendations as they're made with one exception. I'm -- I'm
21 thinking rather than saying will be relieved, I would -- I
22 would suggest that we say may be relieved. There could be
23 extenuating circumstances that force that.

24 So I'd recommend that we leave these in, except with
25 the change that we change "will" to "may."

1 CHAIR FISHER: Okay. Thank you. Any other comments
2 by committee members on the first part?

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER KELLER: Mr. Chairman --

4 CHAIR FISHER: John?

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER KELLER: -- a minor technical point.
6 On page 50, letter E, it talks about advising a parent
7 organizations on significant issues -- jump ahead -- exclusive
8 to California. Was there a particular rationale why we
9 wouldn't be advising more broadly?

10 CHAIR FISHER: I think the reason for that language
11 is that we have requirements in the -- in the Federal MUTCD
12 that automatically become part of the California MUTCD. If
13 it's a federal requirement I don't know that we would want to
14 obligate our members to have to inform persons in California of
15 all the federal requirements that are part of the California
16 manual, but rather to focus their attention on those things
17 that are unique to California.

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER KELLER: So this is more of a
19 minimum standard rather than the broader -- I mean, certainly
20 we could operate beyond this. This is a requirement as opposed
21 to what we might do outside of the -- our representations on
22 the committee.

23 CHAIR FISHER: Right. I mean, I think that was the
24 intent. That would be a minimum requirement, but not that we
25 have the burden of informing everyone of what's in the Federal

1 MUTCD that becomes part of the California MUTCD, but rather to
2 identify those things that are special, unique, special
3 requirements to California that they need to focus their
4 attention on.

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER KELLER: Thank you.

6 CHAIR FISHER: Any other comments from committee
7 members on part one?

8 Hearing none, I'd like to now go to part two which
9 relates to the additional members of the committee, and to take
10 in the needs of all users of streets, roads and highways in
11 California.

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Mr. Chairman, are we
13 planning --

14 CHAIR FISHER: Let's focus on that part. Yes, Hamid?

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: -- are we planning to go
16 back and get two votes on each part or you want to have a full
17 discussion and then take a vote on the whole bylaws.

18 CHAIR FISHER: I think I'd like to see which way --

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Okay.

20 CHAIR FISHER: -- the discussion goes. Okay.

21 Now we're going to focus on the additional members of
22 the committee, and to take into account the need of all road
23 users. So let's focus on that part of the discussion by
24 committee members.

25 Any comments, discussions, questions by members of

1 the committee?

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: Regarding that Article II,
3 essentially that first paragraph in Article II?

4 CHAIR FISHER: Yes. Mr. Keller brought that up. So,
5 John, did you want to comment on that?

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER KELLER: I think my first comment
7 will be broader than that. I think it is the responsibility of
8 the -- of each committee member to represent all users of the
9 transportation system, the highway system. And we oppose the
10 bill and the legislature because we felt that it was -- that it
11 was unnecessary, and we would oppose the expansion of the
12 committee. We opposed the bill that would have required
13 expansion of the committee and the legislature. And we feel,
14 continue to feel that it is unnecessary to expand the committee
15 when it's our -- we feel it's each member's responsibility to
16 represent all users.

17 CHAIR FISHER: Thank you. Any other comments from
18 committee members?

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: Well, I'm make one, yeah.

20 CHAIR FISHER: Sorry. Oh. Jeff?

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: Right. Well --

22 CHAIR FISHER: I'm sorry. Oh, I'm sorry. Wayne, did
23 you want to say --

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: Okay. Yeah. I just wanted
25 to say, you know, I -- with all this gray hair, I've been

1 with -- with the -- with the organization for quite a while,
2 even back when we were the Division of Highways. And ever
3 since the early '70s we have been trying like heck to earn a
4 reputation as being a true multi-modal agency. You know,
5 between funding, you know, a lot of inner-city rail we have all
6 sort of advisory committees on various, you know, modes of
7 transportation. We are quite responsive to a lot of our
8 stakeholders. And I think this is just another attempt to make
9 darn sure that we are, you know, sincere in our efforts to --
10 to address all modes.

11 And as you know, we had this bill that basically
12 tried to tell us how to, you know, how to conduct the -- the
13 business of the -- of -- of setting the standards for traffic
14 control devices in California. And we said wait a minute, I
15 think we -- we -- we do a sincere job of trying to consider all
16 the users. But we did have a law that was, you know, moving
17 down the track, and it was -- it looked like a pretty good
18 chance of it passing. And we said wait a minute, we -- we can
19 do this administratively.

20 And what we're talking about here is trying to -- to
21 follow up on our promise of doing this administratively. And
22 so if we go any other way we, you know, are liable to go back
23 to the -- to the law, and then we'll have the legislature
24 setting up the CTCDC and -- and how it's governed.

25 CHAIR FISHER: Thank you, Wayne.

1 Jeff?

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Well, I had a couple
3 concerns. I mean, one of them is actually reading California
4 Vehicle Code 21400. I mean, it specifically talks about the
5 need for Caltrans to consult with "local agencies," quote
6 unquote, because the standards that are being said directly
7 impact our policies, quality of life, you know, practices
8 within our agencies. And so the legislature actually set up
9 that requirement, you know, authorizing Caltrans to establish
10 the MUTCD or a traffic manual or standard within the state, but
11 only after consulting with local agencies.

12 And even with the proposed change I would strongly
13 encourage the adoption of the phrase "local agencies" within
14 these articles rather than striking -- striking it out, because
15 we do have that special relationship with regards to 21400 and
16 the need to consult with us prior to making changes that
17 directly affect us.

18 I mean, the second thing is -- and I do understand
19 what Wayne said, and I am going to support this overall,
20 hopefully with that change, but it kind of reflects, I guess, a
21 failure on transportation engineers' parts that for -- some how
22 the public doesn't see us as representing all of our
23 constituents. Because as the city traffic engineer and
24 somebody that's been in this business since high school, you
25 know, over 30 years, I mean, I deal with all of the safe-

1 routes-to-school issues. Whether you're, you know, a
2 kindergartener or you're a high school student, riding, biking,
3 taking the bus or being driven, I'm the one the public
4 contacts. If it's a pedestrian, a bicycle group, yes, I deal
5 with motorists, too, but they're just -- you know, they're
6 motorists while they're not walking and they're motorists while
7 they're not riding their bikes or on the bus. And so we have
8 to look at sidewalks the same -- and pedestrian timing the same
9 way that we look at vehicle timing at signals or, you know,
10 where we place crosswalks or how we do speed limits, and all
11 the various things.

12 So you know, I don't know that we're demanding that,
13 you know, a motor vehicle representative be on the bicycle
14 advisory committee or on other mobility committees as if -- I'm
15 hoping that when the cyclists propose rules they're thinking of
16 both sides of the story when they're making a recommendation.
17 Otherwise, they come up with unworkable proposals that we can't
18 either afford or that just, you know, don't work in real life.
19 They're a nice concept but they don't work in real life.

20 So you know, I wish this wasn't necessary. I'm not
21 clear on the criteria Caltrans will be using to select an
22 individual. I mean, one of the advantages we have is having
23 reviewed thousands in our career of collision reports so we
24 know what's going on in the field and the causes of those
25 collisions and driver behaviors, statistics from all around the

1 country when we're looking at cost effective traffic control
2 devices. So I'm not sure when we're talking speed limits and
3 case histories what these individuals are going to bring to the
4 table that are outside of just personal opinions but actually
5 reflect technical data, things that are proven to work in other
6 agencies and what does work and what doesn't work.

7 And what I would propose because of our special
8 relationship with Caltrans, as stated in 21400, that -- not
9 that the League of California Cities be allowed to -- to reject
10 a proposed candidate by Caltrans, but that Caltrans would
11 nominate people and consult with both the Association of
12 Counties and League of California Cities submitting like the --
13 the proposed candidates, you know, resumes to the League so
14 that at least we have some feel for does this represent, you
15 know, the types of cyclists or equestrian or, you know,
16 disabled people in our communities. Because I've been
17 concerned in the past from some of the comments we've gotten
18 from the Bicycle Advisory Committee that they seem to only
19 represent very aggressive adult high-speed cyclists and not the
20 children that are going to school, and not the recreational
21 rider, and not the person that isn't going to be aggressive and
22 take the lane but wants to be on that class one bike path and
23 wants to be a little bit, you know, more mainstream than -- so
24 I think that it would help -- I think everything you're
25 proposing in these bylaws, there something that the League can

1 support, but we don't want to lose our place at the table or in
2 any way just be reduced to another stakeholder when, actually,
3 we have a special relationship with Caltrans within the
4 California Vehicle Code.

5 CHAIR FISHER: Thank you, Jeff.

6 Hamid?

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: I would like to echo some
8 of what Mr. Knowles said. First of all, in terms of were we
9 better off going administratively or legislatively, I've been
10 doing this for not -- not too long, maybe about ten years,
11 being around the legislative circles in Sacramento. Just
12 because an assembly person or a senator introduces a bill it
13 doesn't mean anything. They introduce a lot of bills, and
14 pretty much one out of four or one out of five in some years
15 passes. The other ones, they just don't even get out of the
16 committee. So AB 345 may have not gone anyway to begin with.
17 But -- and so there would be no burden on Caltrans to do
18 anything.

19 But if the decision was made that better, you know,
20 to kind of do preventive measure and say, okay, don't run the
21 bill, we're going to go do it administratively, I think that
22 decision is done.

23 And quite frankly, when you look at the practice and
24 the reality and the law, this committee has no jurisdiction
25 whatsoever to tell Caltrans director how to form this

1 committee. It's a decision by Caltrans director. Caltrans
2 director can decide to have 75 people, he can decide to have 4
3 people. It's his call. And at this point the Caltrans
4 director is an appointed official by the governor of the state,
5 he's the legal authority on the matter, and he has decided that
6 he wants to add two members to the committee. That's his
7 decision. As far as I see it that's the end of the story.

8 The only thing is that how we kind of make sure that
9 the committee that has been around 40 years plus remains
10 effective and remains focused, and remains a technical
11 engineering committee. There's a misconception that this
12 committee can do anything to promote the complete street
13 program in California, or to provide more funding for bicyclist
14 and pedestrian projects, or can change public policy and
15 transportation policy. All of those are completely 100 percent
16 false, as for us who have been serving on the committee well
17 know. We have no jurisdiction whatsoever in any of those
18 areas.

19 We look at the size of the lettering, the size of the
20 sign, the vertical clearance, and how far you place them;
21 that's what we do. We are not going to be able to say -- to
22 say to the city convert your travel lane to a bicycle lane or
23 vice versa, or make sure that the bicycle lane is included in
24 the new street design. Those are not the purview of our
25 committee. We have no purview over that whatsoever.

1 But some people feel that by getting into this
2 committee they might be able to promote something that -- that
3 has been neglected maybe, which I completely disagree with, for
4 California to go to the newer cities. By the newer cities I
5 mean newer cities that have been designed in the last 30 years
6 or 35 years, they all have excellent bicycle and pedestrian
7 facilities.

8 The time of -- like the -- if you're looking Downtown
9 L.A., Downtown L.A. was designed in the 19th century.
10 Obviously, you know, there's a completely different design
11 concept. But if you go look at places like Irvine, Mission
12 Viejo, which I'm more familiar with, or other newer cities that
13 were developed after the '70s, they all are based on the modern
14 urban transportation planning principles and they usually have
15 hiking trails, they have equestrian trails, they have bicycle
16 trails, they have more bicycle-type facilities and all that.

17 Having said all that I think it's a done deal. We're
18 going to add two members. The question is that how Caltrans is
19 going to make sure that this committee does not become a
20 political, philosophical committee to start debating
21 transportation modes and the national and the state
22 transportation policies. Because, with all due respect, it's
23 none of the damn business of this committee. It's not even the
24 jurisdiction of the committee.

25 So the bylaws, I'm comfortable with it. We just said

1 very clearly that it's only on traffic control devices. And
2 it's going to be then maybe the job of our future chairman and
3 vice chair to make sure that our discussions stay focused and
4 our committee stays productive, rather than me standing half-
5 an-hour or half a meeting discussing the conspiracy of the
6 General Motors and the tire barons to the earlier 20th century
7 to do transportation planning in the United States because it's
8 not going to be productive to the work of the committee.

9 CHAIR FISHER: Okay. Thank you, Hamid.

10 Before I go to members of the audience I just want to
11 make sure that every committee member here has an opportunity
12 to at least make a comment. If we can, though, can we start at
13 the end and go down the table, or do you have something that
14 you need to say right now?

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: No. I can save my comment.

16 CHAIR FISHER: Okay. John, did you have any comments
17 on that?

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER PRESLEIGH: No, I have no comments
19 on this.

20 CHAIR FISHER: Okay.

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER PRESLEIGH: So I actually agree with
22 the two individuals here that it seems like it's a done deal
23 and we have to add these two members. And the -- the policy is
24 this is a Traffic Control Devices Committee; we should stick to
25 that. So I do support that.

1 I would -- there is one item, and I think it was
2 brought up, that we did eliminate a lot of the verbiage for
3 local when we changed the policy. And I looked at that, too,
4 and I caught that. And I was wondering why that was
5 eliminated, so much of the local out. Because it is -- a good
6 part of this is the local agencies reporting back or -- or
7 developing a policy with -- in coordination with Caltrans.

8 CHAIR FISHER: Okay. Jeff, did you have any other
9 comments you want to make?

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: No.

11 CHAIR FISHER: Okay. I'll just be real brief. I'm
12 going to support the bylaws as proposed with a little bit of
13 reluctance. I do feel that most of us who serve on this
14 committee have been very concerned with non-motorized users,
15 whether it's transit patrons, bicyclists, pedestrians, the
16 sight impaired, or the handicapped. And, I mean, just some of
17 the items that we discussed earlier in the agenda demonstrate
18 that. So I think by necessity we have to be concerned with all
19 modes and we have been concerned with all modes.

20 But ultimately I feel that Caltrans has the right to
21 establish the composition of the committee to advise it. And
22 with that I'll make no further comment, and we'll go to Wayne.

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: Okay. I just had two
24 points I wanted to make. The first is on the selection
25 criteria we pretty well broadcast -- broadcast that to the

1 world. I know we went to all the CTCDC member and we solicited
2 any, you know, suggestions for -- for improvements to the
3 criteria. We also went directly to CSAC and League saying send
4 it out to your members. You know, these are the selection
5 criteria. So -- and we didn't get as much back as you might
6 think.

7 And then, let's see, the other point that I wanted to
8 make was -- oh, gosh, now I've -- I've dropped the point so I
9 can't remember.

10 CHAIR FISHER: Okay. Well, if you think of it
11 we'll -- we'll come back to you.

12 Dwight, did you want to make any comments?

13 COMMITTEE MEMBER KU: I guess I'll just say it in
14 bullet points, just repeating, I think what I had said the last
15 committee meeting. I'm concerned about the -- the process of
16 the committee so that, you know, administratively whether or
17 not there are going to be any quorum or vote issues.

18 And then with respect to the commitment, and we
19 discussed that in the first part of the discussion today.

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: I remembered my point.
21 It's better to be lucky than good, and that's that if -- if you
22 look at the quorum or the, you know, we need a vote of seven
23 to -- to come up with a formal recommendation to Caltrans.
24 Well, if you notice there are four cities -- four
25 representatives of cities and counties. So -- so the local

1 government still essentially has a veto on the outcomes of the
2 deliberations of this group.

3 CHAIR FISHER: Thank you. John, did you have any
4 further comments?

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER KELLER: Sure. I guess I would
6 comment that CTCDC is an advisory committee to the department.
7 And the department has other advisory committees that provide
8 avenues for which they can get specific modal input or specific
9 input from special users of the transportation system. So that
10 I would offer to clarify that our perspective, that adding
11 users that are representing a subgroup of the total creates an
12 efficacy process that hasn't existed before and we don't feel
13 is necessary.

14 In terms of process, the comment has been made that
15 it's a done deal in the sense that the director should be able
16 to implement the committee as he sees fit. You know, in terms
17 of process, we do have bylaws which provide for how the
18 composition of the committee can be altered as -- as dictated
19 by the committee.

20 So certainly in the broader perspective the committee
21 was conceived of as a way to fulfill the requirements of the
22 vehicle code. But it does have a life outside of Caltrans, and
23 presumably we would look to the bylaws to govern the operations
24 of -- of the committee, which -- and the bylaws say that the --
25 the committee approves changes to the bylaws. The director

1 doesn't have free rein to do that.

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Mr. Chairman?

3 CHAIR FISHER: Thank you, John. Let's go to Mike.

4 VICE CHAIR ROBINSON: Well, I hope my -- my thoughts
5 and comments are going to prove more prophetic than reveal the
6 naivety of my newness on this -- on this committee.

7 I'm a trained civil engineer, trained traffic
8 engineer. And all that training that I've got helps me to try
9 to do the best that I can for all users of the road. I don't
10 live in an ivory tower, however, and realize that I have
11 strengths and weaknesses. And I recognize that there are
12 others who have strengths where I have weaknesses. I'm hoping
13 and thinking that those who join us on this committee would
14 provide some strengths in areas where we can improve in our
15 decision making and help -- help our -- our group as a whole
16 move forward into the future as a lot of the policies and the
17 ways and means that we go about our business have changed.

18 So I personally, and my group, supports the addition
19 of these new members. And I'm looking forward to working with
20 new folks and learning from -- from their strengths so that I
21 can improve on my weaknesses. Thank you.

22 CHAIR FISHER: Hamid. And then we'll go to members
23 of the audience.

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Mr. Chairman, back -- I
25 would like to kind of make a clarification on the -- on -- on

1 the point that the CHP representative brought up. Last time
2 that Caltrans' staff brought the issue in front of the
3 committee, the committee unanimously, all members of the
4 committee, opposed expansion. There was not a single vote on
5 the committee supporting adding members. Yet Caltrans' staff
6 and the director have brought the new bylaws back to us. So
7 either the representative from CHP has a point, has a veto
8 point, that the director can not just go unilaterally and
9 change the bylaws, or the director can add 85 people to the
10 committee because this is a committee under California Vehicle
11 Code.

12 So that's the part that I'm saying. I'm saying the
13 last time that the issue was brought there was not a single
14 vote of support in the committee for expansion and adding
15 members, yet now we have a new bylaws that adds two members.
16 And from that point I'm saying it's a done deal because the
17 committee voted, we don't want to expand and add members, yet
18 the director said, no, I want to add it. So I know that I'm
19 not -- I'm not well versed in the rules and regulations about
20 the bylaws and committees, but it appears that the director
21 felt that he can just add members.

22 CHAIR FISHER: Okay. Thank you. Now we'll go to
23 comment from members of the audience. This is your opportunity
24 to comment on the item regarding the expansion of the
25 committee. Please come up and make your comments. I ask you

1 to succinct. Please state your name and your affiliation for
2 the record.

3 MS. GERAGHTY: Anne Geraghty, Walk Sacramento, and
4 also co-chair of the SHSP Challenge Area 8.

5 For a number of years we've had concerns with the
6 decision of this committee and felt that walking was not
7 represented on this committee, even though as you state, each
8 of you have a dedication to the safety of all individuals.
9 However, the decisions that we felt came out of this committee
10 felt that we weren't represented. And so we have pushed, along
11 with many others, to have this kind of representation.

12 I just want to give you a little history because I
13 want to suggest that Michael Robinson is really on the right
14 track in saying that the enlargement is going to be good, not
15 only for this committee but also good for us as advocates for
16 pedestrians and bicyclists. And that is because it will put us
17 on an even playing field. In other words, we'll be able to
18 have the dialogue as opposed to you being we and -- we and
19 them.

20 Many -- I have been in this business for many, many
21 years, going back to the '70s as a transportation planner at
22 the Air Resources Board, and in other capacities. And over
23 those years our society has been auto dominated. And it's
24 reflected in how we do all kinds of things. There's no blame.
25 We all love automobiles, me included, and I'm a member of the

1 3H.

2 In 1998 we formed Walk Sacramento because walking
3 wasn't really being addressed. There were places that had no
4 sidewalks and continue to have no sidewalks today, or bad
5 crossings. This wouldn't have happened if we were multi-modal
6 50 years ago, but we didn't think about it. So we knew that we
7 needed to be at the table. And because we've been at the table
8 things are changing in Sacramento.

9 This is important for your committee and it -- but
10 it's going to be good, not only for you but for us, so we will
11 better understand the issues that you are -- are the technical
12 experts on.

13 Now I want you to know I'm not applying to be on
14 this. You don't need to worry about that. You won't have
15 rabble-rousers like me. We'll be urging you on, but we want
16 people that are experts like you to be on this committee. And
17 I know Richard, for one, is one of the people that is applying.
18 He's an engineer. He can talk your language. I can bug him
19 about things. He can -- he can be a liaison between us. He
20 can explain to me why you -- you did something that I thought
21 was inane; he'll say, no, it wasn't. So I think it can be
22 really, really very good in both directions.

23 We really need to move -- so here's the rabble-
24 rouser -- we need to move to a truly multi-modal society for
25 our health and for all kinds of reasons. And you have to

1 acknowledge that there have been many, many traffic engineering
2 decisions that have not been good for walking and bicycling,
3 bicycling of all types. So I just want to say this is a very
4 positive, I think going to be a very positive situation for all
5 of us. And thank you for supporting it, even if you didn't
6 originally.

7 CHAIR FISHER: Thank you.

8 MR. HAGGSTROM: Richard Haggstrom, Strategic Highway
9 Safety Plan Challenge Area 8, which is pedestrian safety. And
10 I also did work for Caltrans. I retired last December. And
11 I've worked with Anne for quite a number of years. I used to
12 be the co-chair of the Strategic Highway Safety Plan Challenge
13 Area 8 with her.

14 And I just want to say I understand, I think, some of
15 the apprehension about this proposed change. I think you'll
16 find that your apprehensions aren't really justified. I think
17 you will be actually happy to have some people with expertise
18 and background in -- in multi-modal transportation, maybe
19 beyond what you yourselves have.

20 I have noticed in the past, having attended some of
21 the CTCDC meetings and workshop related to the MUTCD, where I
22 felt that the level of knowledge about research into pedestrian
23 safety issues in particular, which is my area of expertise,
24 was -- was somewhat lacking. There was a lack of having read
25 some of the basic research on traffic control devices that were

1 being proposed. And I actually had to print up and distribute
2 it to one workshop. And it was clear from the -- and CTCDC
3 members read it over night, and then they came back the next
4 day. And it was clear from the discussion that they still
5 weren't really familiar with -- with the concept. And I'm
6 speaking particularly about the issue of adoption of the
7 pedestrian hybrid beacon. And so I was very disappointed about
8 that.

9 But I have noticed other -- other instances where it
10 seems like things that are very important to pedestrians, and
11 also bicyclists, are not considered that important to this
12 body. And I think it's totally understandable. I'm an
13 engineer myself, and I specialized in transportation
14 engineering. I got very little education on -- on pedestrians
15 or bicyclists. I think the main thing I learned was that
16 pedestrians walk at 4 feet per second, which I think is now
17 under some -- some contention, as well.

18 So things have come a long way. And I'm not sure to
19 which -- to what extent traffic engineers have been able to
20 assimilate sort of like the avalanche of research that's come
21 about on pedestrian and bicycle transportation. I know
22 everybody here is extremely busy with your agencies and with
23 your other duties, as well. So it's hard to keep up, I think,
24 in those particular areas without having some -- some degree of
25 specialization.

1 And I'd also like to point out that pedestrians and
2 bicyclists are not the -- would not be the only advocacy groups
3 on this -- on this group. I mean, we have two automobile
4 association representatives representing a specific mode. And
5 I think it's perfectly appropriate that we have other
6 representatives just helping to balance that out.

7 CHAIR FISHER: Thank you.

8 MR. KLINKER: Hello. Sorry. I'm Daniel Klinker, and
9 I'm representing the California Bicycle Advisory Committee
10 today. Our chairman asked me to come in and represent the
11 committee regarding this item. And -- and the committee -- the
12 committee supports and has been advocating the non-motorists
13 representation on the -- on the CTCDC, but it hasn't quite come
14 about maybe the way the committee had -- I think the committee
15 was looking that they wanted to be represented here. And so
16 this is a different approach.

17 And I've been a member on the California Bicycle
18 Advisory Committee for five years now. And during that whole
19 time that committee has -- has wanted to have a place at the
20 table at this committee. And we came to -- there was some
21 accommodation made back in March 2010 where the -- the chairman
22 of the committee was made an ex officio member of this
23 committee, non-voting, but able to come and address the
24 committee on all the bicycle advisory committees that would
25 join in that debate. And the Bicycle Committee wants to see

1 that relationship continue and that we will not say, well, we
2 have these two -- two other representatives so we don't need
3 you anymore.

4 And regarding the Bicycle Advisory Committee, that
5 actually is composed of similar representation as this
6 committee. Hamid is on that committee. A representative from
7 the CHP is supposed to be on the committee but we haven't --
8 but they haven't been attending on a regular basis. I
9 represent the -- I'm on the committee as a representative of
10 the California Association of Counties. And I'm a civil
11 engineer, traffic engineer with the County of Sacramento
12 Transportation Department.

13 So in our last meeting the -- the motion was -- a
14 motion was -- was passed and carried that -- that that
15 relationship that -- that the CBAC with the -- this committee
16 would continue, that you would continue to -- bicycle issues
17 would continue to be, you know, sent to our committee for our
18 evaluation and input into your deliberations, and that we also
19 continue that relationship as a non-voting member, and that the
20 bylaws would actually be changed to -- to note that, as well,
21 so that the chairman of the California Bicycle Advisory
22 Committee would also be an ex officio member or a non-voting
23 member and that that relationship that has been established
24 over these last two years would continue.

25 CHAIR FISHER: Thank you. Okay. Let's go to Jeff,

1 then Hamid.

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: I'm trying to understand
3 how you would envision this working. I think this meeting so
4 far might provide a good context for us, for me to understand
5 your point of view and why you want me to vote a certain way
6 to -- to provide inclusion. For example, when you look at the
7 agenda that we've already gone through, so you're sitting at
8 the -- you or somebody like you representing your interests are
9 at the table, and we're talking about "No Parking Vehicle for
10 Sale" sign, tow-away, so how do you decide how you're going to
11 vote? You can tell from the people that spoke on that that
12 we're all representing our agencies. And some of us, I think
13 I'm at my seventh agency so I'm thinking about all the
14 communities I've worked at before, how I've chased cars parked
15 for sale all around town, the cost of putting up the signs,
16 the -- we deal with enforcement. We have somebody representing
17 the people that will be towed, so they're kind of speaking up
18 to make sure my members have good notification that, you know,
19 I'm at risk.

20 So here I'm representing these agencies. And then
21 you're at the table and you're going to vote. It has nothing
22 to do with cycling. So are you a vote against me, for me? How
23 are you -- how do you make your decision, not representing
24 anybody involved in that discussion or almost anything we've
25 talked about on the agenda so far?

1 MR. KLINKER: I wasn't -- I was -- I am advocating
2 for the continuing relationship that we've already established
3 with the committee, and I wasn't asking to be made a voting
4 member.

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: No. But I mean, what --
6 what I'm trying to understand, though, is if you were selected,
7 not that you've even applied for the position, but I don't
8 understand what you would have brought to the table when we
9 talked about the "No Parking Vehicle for Sale" signs. You can
10 see my relationship with Caltrans representing my agencies and
11 my group of agencies because this rule will directly impact my
12 city.

13 CHAIR FISHER: Jeff, I think he was making the point,
14 he wasn't supporting the bylaws as proposed, he was supporting
15 this interim arrangement we've had where if we have a bicycle
16 matter on the agenda then we invite the Bicycle Advisory
17 Committee to take part in those deliberations.

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Well, I guess I'm trying
19 to -- so is -- is the BAC actually opposing this change in the
20 bylaws? Because I'm trying to understand what somebody --

21 MR. KLINKER: No, we're not proposing the change.

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Well, but -- okay. So --

23 CHAIR FISHER: In other words, he may -- he may be
24 supporting the bylaws change, but he wants to also have the BAC
25 invited to participate in discussion on a bicycle matter if it

1 comes up.

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: But with this change in
3 the bylaws they're a seated voting member on all issues. So
4 what I was trying to understand is that --

5 CHAIR FISHER: Not --

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: -- can you understand,
7 even if it's just going back to the BAC with some existing
8 members opinions that whether we're talking "No Parking Vehicle
9 for Sale" signs, or whether you as a cyclist are voting on
10 pedestrian button placards, or the final draft for the MUTCD,
11 or all these different things we've talked about, that the
12 existing members have a very different relationship with these
13 details than a typical pedestrian representative or a typical
14 bicycle representative do.

15 And for us, that's one of the reasons why this change
16 is difficult is because we don't know -- you're a big unknown
17 factor. Here we had a discussion specifically on pedestrian
18 push buttons. And almost everybody that spoke, almost, was an
19 engineer that either designs signals, operates signals, buys
20 signs, maintains the stuff, and very little -- we didn't have,
21 you know, ten people from the pedestrian community that wanted
22 to talk about specifically how they use this placard or how one
23 placard or another would change their life. I mean, directly
24 on a subject that we could have had pedestrian advocate
25 feedback on we had almost no feedback.

1 So I -- in terms of the goal of creating complete
2 streets, walkable communities, I understand all of that. But
3 in terms of the functioning of this body I don't envision how
4 we're going to affect the changes you're really after because
5 as Hamid was saying, we don't recommend put in a bike lane. We
6 just say if you're going to stripe a bike lane make the stripe
7 six inches wide. I mean, it doesn't -- but it doesn't affect
8 whether it's a complete street or a walkable community because
9 we don't design bump outs, for example. That's a street
10 fixture feature, not a traffic control device. We're only
11 dealing with -- if you put in a pedestrian bump out to reduce
12 pedestrian crossing distances do you need a sign? Do you
13 stripe it?

14 CHAIR FISHER: Is there a question for Mr. Klinker?

15 MR. KLINKER: Well, that's not a question for me.
16 I'm not advocating -- I'm not advocating that the CBAC be this
17 member. Okay. The --

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: But do you see what I'm
19 saying?

20 MR. KLINKER: The CBAC would have preferred to have
21 been the member, but that's not how it came down. It came down
22 through this -- this bill came down, you're going to have two
23 motorized members.

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Right. I'm just saying,
25 as -- as an educated --

1 MR. KLINKER: There was another organization --

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: -- cyclists --

3 MR. KLINKER: -- advocating for that. The Bicycle
4 Committee has been advocating to be a member of the committee.
5 This arrangement that was done back in March of 2010 has been
6 working better than the way things were before. We are not --
7 I'm not -- I came here to speak to the -- to say that there is
8 a concern by the committee that -- that the two new members,
9 which do not represent the California Bicycle Advisory
10 Committee, maybe we have some of the same concerns you do.
11 Well, who are these people? And they're acting on their own.
12 And -- and they're not speaking for us. We're in the
13 committee. We're supposed to be the experts. We're supposed
14 to be the people advising Caltrans.

15 SECRETARY SINGH: Actually, Jeff's question goes to
16 the previous speakers.

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: I just thought he would be
18 the good -- a good person to answer that.

19 CHAIR FISHER: Okay. Well --

20 MR. KLINKER: Well, I'm -- I'm a licensed civil
21 engineer, a licensed traffic engineer, and I design signals,
22 so -- so what are you --

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: And I ride bikes.

24 CHAIR FISHER: Do we have comments --

25 MR. KLINKER: I don't -- yeah.

1 CHAIR FISHER: -- from members in the audience?
2 Let's try to keep it concise, to no more than five minutes.
3 And let's try to keep our questions short.

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Okay. I have a question.

5 CHAIR FISHER: Did you have a question of Mr.
6 Klinker?

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Actually, I have a
8 question for you and Anne. I think it goes back to Caltrans
9 also.

10 CHAIR FISHER: Make it a short question.

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Yes, please. Because --
12 because what I'm hearing from -- okay. And I need
13 clarification from Caltrans on this point. What I'm hearing is
14 that the changes to these bylaws, the standing executive order
15 that was issued by the Caltrans director, whenever it was,
16 March or something, that -- not bicycle related, the chairman
17 of CBAC will serve as an ex officio member here, that that will
18 go away. I see -- I see Mr. Henley shaking --

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: Yeah. No. We --

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Okay.

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: We will still continue.
22 Yeah, obviously, CBAC advises the department.

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Yeah. Okay.

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: Believe me --

25 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Yeah. I just -- yeah, I

1 just wanted to --

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: And so we make it a point
3 that all the deliberations regarding -- you know, that has to
4 do with bicycles go to CBAC before they come here.

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Perfect.

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: So that's the same.

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: I just wanted to clarify
8 so that I know what we are doing here. Thank you.

9 MR. KLINKER: Well, that's -- that's -- that was the
10 point. We're concerned about we do not want that to happen at
11 the Bicycle Advisory Committee. We do not believe that this
12 new -- this -- this new member to be appointed, these two -- by
13 the way, I have one clarification. So it's just three new
14 members. And then it also says Caltrans earlier in the
15 stakeholders. So are those -- are you the third member?

16 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: Yeah, I'm the third member.

17 MR. KLINKER: Oh. Okay. Well, you might want to
18 clear that language up. Because where it talks about the
19 different stakeholders it talks about the Caltrans, someone
20 from Caltrans. And then later it talks about three people
21 being appointed by the director.

22 But -- but that -- that is the concern of the
23 committee. The concern of the committee is that this letter is
24 going to go away, that these procedures that we have worked --
25 that the committee has worked so hard in the last five years

1 are going to go out the window and be replaced by someone who
2 may or may not be able to attend however many meetings a year
3 and represent the California Bicycle Advisory Committee's
4 recommendations at this meeting, at -- to this group here.

5 And so what I hear Mr. Henley saying is that, yes,
6 that is going to happen. The -- the relationship that we've
7 worked so hard for over the last five years is going out the
8 window and it's going to be replaced by these two non-motorized
9 members, and that is not something that -- that the California
10 Bicycle Advisory Committee supports and is -- and is very
11 concerned that -- that -- that our recommendations are now not
12 going to be heard by this committee.

13 CHAIR FISHER: Okay. Thank you. Thank you.

14 Jacob?

15 MR. BABICO: Jacob Babico from the County of San
16 Bernardino.

17 On page 51, paragraph A in red, the way it's written
18 that the State of California would -- would assign -- designate
19 three delegates from X organization, not from outside Caltrans
20 organization. Is that true? It says "one of whom will
21 represent road users, and two of whom will represent non-
22 motorized road users." But they are within the organization of
23 the DOT?

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: No. No.

25 MR. BABICO: So it's not clear.

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Well, it's clear, it just
2 is at their discretion.

3 MR. BABICO: If that is so does that mean CSAC and
4 League of Cities can go outside their organization, contract
5 out two members and alternates and bring them to the committee?
6 Is that --

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: Yeah, true.

8 MR. BABICO: Okay.

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: I don't think it says that
10 you have to be a city engineer or a county engineer.

11 Presumably, you know, they could -- you know, L.A. could hire,
12 you know, a consultant to come and represent their interests.

13 MR. BABICO: Yeah. It wasn't clear, this paragraph,
14 for me. I thought it was only within the Caltrans
15 organization.

16 CHAIR FISHER: Okay. Are there any further members
17 of the public who would like to speak on this matter before we
18 close the public comment period? Yes?

19 MS. PRICE: I'm Lindell Price. I'm a member of the
20 public. I gave my address earlier. I -- my comment is that
21 insofar as we all use our roads, pedestrians, bicycles,
22 motorists, public transit, that the issues are not strictly
23 segregated as pedestrian/bicycle/motorist issues, public
24 transit issues. They interact with each other. And I
25 certainly as a motorist feel that my mobility has been better

1 served than when I'm a pedestrian or when I'm a bicyclist, and
2 that the signage, the push buttons, the crossing facilities,
3 the bicycle crossings are not up to the level that I get as a
4 motorist. And I have no doubt of your good intentions and
5 backgrounds in terms of detail. But I think that the balance
6 needs to be improved. So thank you.

7 CHAIR FISHER: Thank you

8 MR. WINTER: Bill Winter, Los Angeles County
9 Department of Public Works.

10 Just the comment that I had submitted, and I see it
11 was incorporated here, it's under Article II, A, and I -- and I
12 kind of, along the lines of a lot of the speakers of the
13 committee, what I added deliberately there is that this
14 committee seems to advise Caltrans. I don't know if that word
15 was previously really in there, or certainly not right up
16 front.

17 I would assume that even the advice given by the
18 committee to Caltrans, it's basically -- it could even be take
19 it or leave it on behalf of Caltrans because they -- they could
20 very well act on something and incorporate it, even if this
21 committee was voting unanimously to oppose something. We could
22 still have that discussion under the vehicle code to -- to
23 really carry out everything associated with traffic. So I
24 appreciate that comment. I mean, that's the context of why it
25 said the word "advise" in there.

1 And I do want to point out to the committee that item
2 D, paragraph D in Article -- Article II, it's shown there in
3 red with some strikeout. But, actually, as it's written, that
4 is actually how it appears today in the bylaws. So there's
5 really not a change to D. I think what was struck out was a
6 suggestion I had made to add to D. I didn't have the red text.
7 But I wanted to put that in because I don't believe
8 experimentation is mentioned elsewhere in the bylaws.

9 And -- and I think this committee does have a role in
10 looking at experimentation requests. I think those are largely
11 sponsored by local authorities, and that's where I had
12 suggested the addition of the Section 385 definition of a local
13 authority. It may not be a significant issues one way or the
14 other, but I did, at least for the -- for the pleasure of the
15 committee just to note that you're really not making a change
16 to do if you go with it as it's -- as it's written here.

17 And then just a very minor thing. Article III, the
18 third line of that, it says "county, State Association of
19 Counties," that's just a typo. That should say "California
20 State Association of Counties."

21 CHAIR FISHER: Okay.

22 MR. THOM: Jeff Thom, California Council of the
23 Blind. I will be very brief. I won't duplicate past
24 commenters. I will align myself with the comments of
25 individuals such as Ms. Geraghty and Mr. Haggstrom.

1 I only wanted to add to that, I really do think
2 whatever the nature of any expansion that you might adopt might
3 be, that based upon the fact that it's going to be overseeing
4 the selection by Caltrans, and the fact that today more than
5 ever before the level of expertise in the community at large,
6 especially in some of the organizations that might seek to have
7 individuals appointed to an entity like your own, is rather
8 sophisticated. And I think that over time it would become even
9 more sophisticated. So I don't see that the dialogue would be
10 such a negative as some members might fear. Thank you very
11 much.

12 CHAIR FISHER: Thank you. If anyone else from the
13 audience wishes to comment on this item, please come up to the
14 podium now. Otherwise, we'll be closing public comment period.
15 I see one more person.

16 MR. PRICE: My name is Stanley Price. I live at 3672
17 Millbrae Road, Cameron Park. There's a public health aspect
18 that I am concerned with. I look at the number of items that
19 are under experimentation and three quarters of them -- I
20 didn't count -- deal with cycling on the roads. If -- if the
21 roads were safe for cyclists those experimentations would not
22 need to be done.

23 A public health angle on that is when it -- when
24 there's vehicle-cyclists or vehicle-pedestrian collisions
25 one -- one of the parties gets hurt, and it -- it can be -- it

1 can be significant.

2 An aside is over the time that I've been reading
3 portions of the minutes of this committee, at one time I was a
4 member of the AAA. I'm not a member now, and felt reading Mr.
5 Ku's representation, I'm afraid he doesn't represent me and I
6 am unable to join the AAA because I'm not being represented
7 by -- by him. And I am also a road user as a pedestrian and a
8 cyclist. Thank you.

9 CHAIR FISHER: Thank you. Last call. Is there any
10 member of the audience who wants to address this issue before
11 we close the public comment period? Seeing none, the public
12 comment period is closed.

13 We bring this matter back to the committee. We
14 discussed this in two parts. We've heard a variety of
15 comments. We have what was submitted by Caltrans. Do we have
16 a motion before us?

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: I'll move that we accept
18 the changes as written?

19 CHAIR FISHER: Accept with changes.

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: Accept as written. In
21 other words, unless somebody wants to amend that and --

22 CHAIR FISHER: Accept as submitted?

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: Yeah.

24 CHAIR FISHER: Okay.

25 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: Accept as submitted.

1 CHAIR FISHER: Okay.

2 SECRETARY SINGH: With minor corrections.

3 CHAIR FISHER: Okay. Well, right now I understand
4 the motion is you're proposing it as you submitted?

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: Right.

6 CHAIR FISHER: Okay. Do we have a second on it? I
7 will second the matter for purposes of discussing it. Are
8 there any comments from committee members?

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Mr. Chairman?

10 CHAIR FISHER: We'll start out with Mike, and then go
11 to Hamid.

12 VICE CHAIR ROBINSON: As I mentioned earlier as we
13 were discussing part one, I would like to see under the -- the
14 topic of -- under the topic of relieving a delegate of their
15 responsibilities, I'd like to see the -- the "will" in that
16 last sentence -- this is page 52, the second paragraph -- I'd
17 prefer to see the "will" be changed to "may."

18 SECRETARY SINGH: Okay.

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: And I -- I'll -- and I'll
20 accept that change right off the top.

21 CHAIR FISHER: You'll -- you'll accept it as a
22 friendly amendment?

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: Yeah.

24 CHAIR FISHER: Change "will" to "may" here at the top
25 of page 52, friendly amendment. Does the -- as the person who

1 seconded the motion I'll agree with that, as well. Okay.

2 Hamid?

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Mr. Chairman, the
4 director of Caltrans has sent -- thank you. The director of
5 Caltrans has sent a very clear signal and message to this
6 committee that this is his committee, and he does with the
7 bylaws and the membership as he wishes. I do not see any
8 reason for me to vote on this. This is a decision made. This
9 is a Caltrans advisory committee. The director decides who
10 represents, how many members, and how the committee affairs are
11 run. I do not even see why this committee should vote on
12 bylaws. It's the Caltrans bylaws, and if they like if and
13 they're happy with it I don't have any problem with it.

14 But I don't see any point in voting. So I will be
15 abstaining because last time that the bylaw changes came the
16 committee unanimously told the staff and the director what
17 direction the committee wants to go. The director has all the
18 legal authority to do what he's doing. I just don't see the
19 merit and the need and even the necessity for the committee to
20 even vote on this. That's the only way that I see it. Thank
21 you.

22 CHAIR FISHER: Jeff?

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Well, I'm going to vote to
24 support the motion, although I completely oppose what we're
25 doing. But I think this is much better than if it were imposed

1 on us by the legislature. We have more control over it here.

2 I would like to offer a friendly amendment that we
3 reinsert "local agencies" in two places. In paragraph A of the
4 second article, I would like to have language that reads
5 something like, you know, "The committee is to take into
6 account the needs of local agencies and users of streets,
7 roads, highways," blah, blah, blah. And then in C to say,
8 "Gather, disseminate, and exchange information among local
9 agencies and other affected stakeholders," at least to keep our
10 name in the game here which is specifically called out in
11 21400.

12 But as I mentioned earlier with one of the speakers
13 at the podium, I just don't see -- I agree with the
14 representative here from the BAC that it was ideal to have the
15 chairman of that committee or his appointee to be at the table
16 to discuss -- and he had voting rights. He could vote on those
17 issues when it was a bicycle issue. But by and large, when
18 it's "Vehicle for Sale" parking signs and when it's, you
19 know -- you know, expiration dates or -- or deadlines to
20 install certain signs or, you know, even horizontal curb
21 warning signs that don't really affect the cyclists, I don't
22 see how they can add to the conversation or what the basis is
23 for their vote on every single issue that generally comes
24 before us.

25 Certainly, I'll state that when something is strictly

1 a highway issue, involves freeways or involves 55-mile-an-hour
2 roadways, which I don't have any in my jurisdiction, I'll go
3 with Caltrans' recommendation as proposed by Caltrans because
4 it has no affect on my local agencies. But I don't like the
5 way that would play into voting, either be for or against or
6 constantly abstaining on votes where we need seven votes to
7 approve something and the pedestrian rep and the bike rep, I
8 don't know where they're going to be coming from in terms of a
9 body of knowledge that gives -- helps them make an informed
10 decision on these matters that really are kind of nuts and
11 bolts issues for anybody that actually works for a local agency
12 and is in charge of public safety in that agency and a budget
13 for that agency in implementing these things.

14 CHAIR FISHER: Jeff, did you make a friendly
15 amendment?

16 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Yes.

17 SECRETARY SINGH: Yeah.

18 CHAIR FISHER: Okay. So I want to make sure that we
19 captured it. As I understand it, in Article II, number A, you
20 would add language to say, "The committee is to take into
21 account the needs of local agencies and all users of" --

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Yeah.

23 CHAIR FISHER: -- "streets, roads," etcetera. And
24 where else would you add the --

25 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: It's C, C in the same

1 article, right before stakeholders I'd put, "Gather,
2 disseminate, and exchange information among local agencies and
3 other affected stakeholders."

4 CHAIR FISHER: Oh. Oh. Okay. So that is a --

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: And then I would accept
6 all the other language.

7 CHAIR FISHER: -- friendly amendment.

8 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: And I accept those too.

9 CHAIR FISHER: You accept that, and I accept that as
10 the person who seconded the motion. Okay.

11 Mike?

12 VICE CHAIR ROBINSON: Jeff, help me to understand, on
13 your first -- on your first recommended change you are
14 recommending that we add "local agencies and other affected
15 stakeholders." Help me to understand.

16 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: I was just inserting
17 "local agencies" back into that statement since we were
18 removing the existing A which referred to local agencies. And
19 21400 authorizes Caltrans to set up these standards throughout
20 the state after consulting with local agencies. I just didn't
21 want to reduce us to the level of just another stakeholder, but
22 wanted to maintain that special relationship that's called out
23 in 21400.

24 VICE CHAIR ROBINSON: I see us -- I see that we're
25 all the same. But I can go along with that if the rest of the

1 committee goes with it.

2 CHAIR FISHER: Any other comments from members of the
3 committee regarding the amended motion?

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER KELLER: Mr. Chairman?

5 CHAIR FISHER: Yes, John?

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER KELLER: Under the provision of A,
7 "The committee needs to take into account," page 49,
8 "The committee is to take into account the needs of all
9 users of streets, roads, and highways specified in
10 Government Code Section."

11 Since there is some difficulty in defining who a non-
12 motorized user would be, that is most of us use the -- the road
13 in multiple capacities, rather than specifying non-motorized
14 road users would it be a friendly amendment to say that --
15 refer back to that government code section to define the -- the
16 use -- excuse me -- the users who would be appointed by
17 Caltrans?

18 CHAIR FISHER: I'm not following you, John. Are you
19 referring to Article I A?

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER KELLER: Under Article II A, the
21 Government Code Section 65302(b) includes disabled users,
22 seniors.

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: Taxis. Every -- it refers
24 to, you know, a whole host --

25 CHAIR FISHER: I thought it refers to all road users.

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: All road users, yeah. It
2 says non-motorized. That section includes --

3 CHAIR FISHER: Correct.

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: -- includes transit and --

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER KELLER: But if -- if this is the
6 requirement that we're trying to serve here then it seems like
7 to restrict it to non-motorized road users is going beyond
8 the -- the scope of that government code section.

9 SECRETARY SINGH: You want to approve the same
10 language in a different section?

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER KELLER: Right. So under -- on page
12 51, Article III A --

13 SECRETARY SINGH: Okay.

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER KELLER: -- "one of whom represents
15 road users and two of whom represent non-motorized users" --

16 SECRETARY SINGH: Okay. So --

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER KELLER: -- so it would say --

18 SECRETARY SINGH: Well, we can say, "as specified in
19 Government Code Section" so and so after that.

20 CHAIR FISHER: I'm not sure what the proposal is
21 under Article III.

22 SECRETARY SINGH: So that we don't -- John wants to
23 do that same section.

24 CHAIR FISHER: Right. But does that section refer to
25 non-motorized road users or all road users? I thought it

1 referred to all road users.

2 SECRETARY SINGH: All. Right.

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER KELLER: All road users.

4 SECRETARY SINGH: Yeah.

5 CHAIR FISHER: Right. So --

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER KELLER: So Caltrans would have the
7 discretion to appoint somebody who represents ADA interests,
8 for example.

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: That could happen, very
10 likely. I mean, yeah, it could be -- you know, I kid with
11 people that we could say, okay, we need representatives of the
12 equestrian community. I mean, they're road users too. I mean,
13 but we just -- I don't think we want to get into that kind of
14 detail.

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER KELLER: Well, no, I'm not
16 suggesting that we specify equestrian users. I'm saying refer
17 back to that government code section rather than specify non-
18 motorized users. So Caltrans appoints member who they feel
19 would represent the implementation of that statutory mandate,
20 not restricted to motorized or non-motorized.

21 CHAIR FISHER: Do you accept that as a friendly
22 amendment, Wayne?

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: Yeah. I'll accept that as
24 a friendly amendment.

25 SECRETARY SINGH: That will make a little difference.

1 CHAIR FISHER: So under that friendly amendment,
2 under Article III what language would you insert?

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER KELLER: My proposal would be to
4 have the red sentence read,

5 "The State of California Department of Transportation
6 shall designate three delegates and three alternates, all
7 of whom represent the users specified in Government Code
8 Section 65302(b)."

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: I no problem with that.

10 CHAIR FISHER: All right. So instead of -- well, but
11 you said all of whom will represent. You mean one of whom?

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER KELLER: Each of them.

13 CHAIR FISHER: All of whom will represent road users
14 as specified in that government section, and two of whom will
15 represent non-motorized road users; is that correct?

16 COMMITTEE MEMBER KELLER: No. I would delete the
17 rest of that sentence. So it would --

18 CHAIR FISHER: Oh, you would delete the rest of the
19 sentence?

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER KELLER: Uh-huh.

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Mr. Chairman?

22 CHAIR FISHER: Are you sure you want to accept that
23 as a friendly amendment, Wayne?

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: Well, you know, actually,
25 where do we talk about non-motorized users? I mean, that's the

1 whole purpose of this exercise.

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Mr. Chairman, the way --
3 the way that it's worded, if the director wants to appoint a
4 transit advocate, a bus rider or a train rider, the way it's
5 worded that person will not qualify because he's still a
6 motorized representative. He's representing transit.

7 CHAIR FISHER: Right.

8 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: So I think that's where
9 the CHP representative is coming from. And I don't want to
10 speak for him. But the way that it's worded is very specific.
11 For example, it excludes transit representation in one of those
12 three new positions, and that might be the intent of the
13 director. But that's just for clarification.

14 CHAIR FISHER: Well, as I understand Keller's
15 proposal, we would eliminate that last part of that sentence
16 that says, "two of whom will represent non-motorized road
17 users." Are you sure you want to accept that as a friendly
18 amendment?

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: No. No. I think, you
20 know, I think you can point to that section of the code that
21 identifies highway users, you know? So presumably two of them
22 will be non-motorized. And you know, theoretically it could be
23 two non-motorized and then one transit operator. I mean, I'd
24 put -- you know, theoretically it can happen. And that's sort
25 of meeting him halfway.

1 CHAIR FISHER: Well, then what -- I don't know what
2 language is being proposed here.

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: Okay. What -- what
4 language do you want to propose, given the fact that, you know,
5 we are going to maintain the two non-motorized users?

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER KELLER: I guess that was the point
7 of -- of the discussion.

8 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: I say we just leave it the
9 way it is. It's a little unwieldy and --

10 CHAIR FISHER: So you don't accept that as a friendly
11 amendment?

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: Right.

13 CHAIR FISHER: Okay.

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Mr. Chairman, one
15 question.

16 CHAIR FISHER: Yes, Hamid?

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: I'm glad that Mr. Winter
18 brought it up also. On the second signature part, as the
19 current -- as the current bylaws, have signature of the
20 presidents of the parent organizations.

21 CHAIR FISHER: What section are you referring to?

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: I'm talking about pages
23 52 and 53. 52 and 53 requires signature of the president of
24 the parent organizations. Why do you need signature of the
25 president of the parent organization?

1 SECRETARY SINGH: That's the people who originally
2 signed it (inaudible) for the parent of an organization.

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: But my question is that
4 does the existing bylaws, the existing bylaws that the Devices
5 Committee have --

6 SECRETARY SINGH: Uh-huh.

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: -- does it have when it
8 was signed, whenever it was last signed that there was a
9 member.

10 SECRETARY SINGH: Yeah.

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: I think it was '92 or
12 something.

13 SECRETARY SINGH: Yeah. It -- it was signed by all
14 the presidents.

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: By the president of AAA?

16 SECRETARY SINGH: Yes. Yes.

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: By the -- by the president
18 of AAA? Wow.

19 SECRETARY SINGH: Yeah. It was signed by the
20 commissioner, our director, CSAC.

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: I think the last time it
22 was amended was '92 or '93 or something.

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: '93, I think, was the last
24 time I saw it.

25 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: '93, I think, was last

1 revision of the bylaws.

2 SECRETARY SINGH: It was signed by the president of
3 the parent companies. Like CSAC will sign, we will sign, Auto
4 Club, everyone will sign.

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Then let me -- let me --
6 hypothetical. If one of the members doesn't -- doesn't --
7 votes no on this today who's going to sign?

8 SECRETARY SINGH: That -- that is not -- six
9 member -- six member --

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: I --

11 SECRETARY SINGH: -- vote on it, it was --

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Okay. So still the
13 bylaws passes and will be signed?

14 SECRETARY SINGH: It will be signed.

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: We don't want -- yeah, we
16 don't want to hold up the process in that regard.

17 SECRETARY SINGH: No.

18 CHAIR FISHER: And let's keep in mind with the motion
19 on the floor we will need six yes votes for the matter to pass.
20 Okay.

21 Any further comments on the amended motion? Seeing
22 none, we'll bring this matter to a vote. It's been amended in
23 several places. I will summarize them. One is in Article II,
24 number A, "The committee is to take into account the needs of
25 local agencies and all users." In Article II C, "Gather,

1 disseminate, and exchange information among local agencies and
2 other affected stakeholders." And in Article III -- I'm sorry,
3 Article IV on page 52, "Delegates who miss three consecutive
4 meetings or three of the most recent six meetings may," not
5 will, "but may be relieved of their service to the CTCDC."

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Mr. Chairman, can I ask a
7 question on that last one?

8 CHAIR FISHER: Yes.

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Why do you want to have
10 that sentence in the bylaws? Is that like, ooh, we're scaring
11 you? I mean, if -- if you say that you miss three meetings and
12 we may consider removing you it doesn't have any affect. Why
13 even mention it?

14 CHAIR FISHER: Just to say we're following a
15 procedure.

16 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: It doesn't say anything.
17 It says absolutely nothing. It says if a member, or actually
18 just a delegate, which I agree with what I think somebody said
19 that it's better to say entity, but if you say a delegate
20 misses three meetings and after missing three consecutive
21 meetings we may remove you, that doesn't have any feet, it
22 doesn't have any clout, it doesn't -- why are we even saying
23 it? I mean, what's the point? That's my concern. If you
24 seriously think that attendance is going to be a problem you
25 have to deal with it. But if you think that it's not going to

1 be a problem why even put something in the bylaws that has
2 absolutely no meaning and no affect on no person behind it?

3 CHAIR FISHER: I think the intent was to encourage
4 participation.

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Well, do that verbally
6 when the members come. Why put it in the bylaw?

7 CHAIR FISHER: I know that at the national committee
8 level it's their practice for one who misses three consecutive
9 meetings to thank and excuse them.

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: But they do that. Then
11 it doesn't say may, it says should or shall. But when you say
12 "may" --

13 CHAIR FISHER: Well, "may" I think allows an
14 exception.

15 VICE CHAIR ROBINSON: Mr. Chairman --

16 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Well, why -- so you're
17 going to -- why are you going to bother? I'm just saying,
18 bylaws for organizations, for committees, serve a purpose.
19 They're riding principles. They're the functionality and
20 operation. If you are just adding frivolous language with a
21 lot of fluff that doesn't have any enforcement behind it,
22 that's not the place in the bylaws.

23 CHAIR FISHER: Well, but supposing someone missed six
24 meetings in a row, hasn't been able to participate for whatever
25 reasons, budgetary, family situation, whatever it may be,

1 wouldn't you at least want a mechanism in your bylaws that --

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Then say it.

3 CHAIR FISHER: -- allows you to remove that person?

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Then say it. Then say

5 you miss six meetings and you're out. It's automatic.

6 CHAIR FISHER: Are you -- are you --

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: I'm just saying --

8 CHAIR FISHER: -- suggesting we go back to the word

9 "will?"

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: I'm just saying that if

11 you put something in the bylaw it's supposed to set up the

12 parameters for the working of the group. It's not supposed to

13 be, well, if you do this we may do this, if you do that we may

14 do that. If -- if -- if we think -- let me finish my point.

15 If you think that participation and attendance is going to be a

16 problem then you'd want to say you miss three consecutive

17 meetings and you're out, excused or non-excused. But if you

18 say we may excuse you what's the -- what's the point of even

19 writing it there?

20 CHAIR FISHER: Who had suggested the word "may," was

21 it Mike?

22 VICE CHAIR ROBINSON: It was me. And I felt it -- I

23 felt it best to put "may" in there because it creates a

24 flexible threshold. It creates the possibility of removal,

25 number one. And number two, it accounts for the possibility

1 that there may be a good reason for a member to be missing
2 for --

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: I think -- I think that
4 if a member -- I think that if a member for a very good reason
5 misses three consecutive meetings, which is all the meetings in
6 one calendar year, that member, himself or herself, should have
7 the courtesy to resign. Because for whatever reason that
8 member does not have the time or the resources to serve. So I
9 don't see any problem with having three consecutive meetings
10 and you're automatically removed because you are not available.
11 You haven't been there for the whole year.

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: I would offer a friendly
13 amendment to change the "may" back to "will," also, because of
14 the future membership, it may help keep Caltrans even out of
15 trouble when they exercise removing somebody from the committee
16 for the lack of attendance because it could be seen
17 traditionally as discriminating against a particular party.
18 And if it strictly says "will" then they can exercise that
19 clause without repercussions.

20 SECRETARY SINGH: And Mike has agreed.

21 VICE CHAIR ROBINSON: I'm fine with that. I'm fine
22 with that.

23 CHAIR FISHER: All right. So you accept that as a
24 friendly amendment, to go back to the original wording, "will?"
25 You accept that, Wayne?

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: Yes.

2 CHAIR FISHER: Okay.

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: I wrote it in the first
4 place.

5 CHAIR FISHER: All right. Okay. So any final
6 discussion on the matter before we vote?

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Let's vote.

8 CHAIR FISHER: Okay. I'll ask for a raising of the
9 hands.

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Mr. Chairman, asking --
11 asking for a roll call vote.

12 CHAIR FISHER: Okay. Let's ask for a roll call vote.
13 We'll start from the right with Mr. Robinson.

14 VICE CHAIR ROBINSON: I vote aye, approve.

15 CHAIR FISHER: Where is Mr. Keller? Oh, there he is.

16 COMMITTEE MEMBER KELLER: Oppose.

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER KU: Abstain.

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: Aye.

19 CHAIR FISHER: Aye.

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Reluctantly, aye.

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: I'll have to abstain.

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER PRESLEIGH: Aye.

23 CHAIR FISHER: If I count correctly we have five
24 ayes, two abstentions, and one opposition, which means the
25 matter does not carry.

1 SECRETARY SINGH: Yes.

2 CHAIR FISHER: So is there any reconsideration of the
3 matter? Is there any amendment someone would like to see that
4 would change and abstention to an aye?

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Mr. Chairman --

6 CHAIR FISHER: Yes.

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: -- I think the committee
8 does not need to -- I do not believe that the committee needs
9 to vote on bylaws.

10 SECRETARY SINGH: Well, if you read -- read page
11 52 --

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Well, okay. It's --

13 SECRETARY SINGH: -- it says --

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Yeah. It's a bylaw that
15 was written.

16 SECRETARY SINGH: Yes.

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Caltrans is significantly
18 changing the bylaws, the working relationship, and the
19 appointment processes. Caltrans can offer bylaws and that
20 bylaws, the way they have been drafted, is going to be signed
21 by the parent organizations and Caltrans is going to appoint
22 two members to the committee, and the committee's business will
23 continue as usual. There is no need for the committee to vote
24 on a bylaw at this point. I don't see why members of the
25 committee -- if Caltrans is interested in the vote of the

1 committee -- the issue came to the committee last time. Not a
2 single vote was for changing the bylaws and bringing it back.
3 They have changed the bylaws, that's a fact. Why does the
4 committee need to vote? Caltrans can draft -- clean up the
5 bylaws as the discussion is going through and submit it for
6 signature by the parent organizations. Why does it need to
7 have approval from the committee at this time? I don't
8 understand that.

9 SECRETARY SINGH: So it means that we can delete
10 section three from bylaws? Section three can be deleted?

11 CHAIR FISHER: Well, let me ask a procedural
12 question. In that this matter did not pass, can Caltrans
13 change the bylaws by executive director?

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: You know, let's -- let's
15 face it, you know, the -- the committee was set up to deal
16 with -- if you think about it the committee was set up to deal
17 with CVC 21400. And so -- so basically the bylaws were set up
18 for the people who are on the committee to operate.

19 Now, you know, the committee had already, I guess,
20 gone out on record saying they don't think they need any
21 additional new members. Caltrans is basically made us a part
22 of radical change and decided, yes, you do need three
23 additional members. And you know, we're still interested in,
24 you know, soliciting your help in putting together the -- you
25 know, by law we have to solicit your help, one way or the

1 other.

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Mr. Chairman, can I make
3 a suggestion here?

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Who was first?

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Can I make a suggestion?
6 Why don't we wait until Caltrans -- excuse me. Why don't we
7 wait until Caltrans goes through the adoption -- the
8 appointment of the two new members, bring the revised bylaws,
9 get approval of the committee at that time with the ten
10 members -- or is it going to be ten? It's going to be ten
11 members. Get a vote of the ten members at that time, and then
12 get the parent organizations to sign. That's -- I think -- I
13 think you're putting parent organizations in a pretty awkward
14 situation.

15 I think if you want to do the change in the
16 membership, proceed with your change in the membership. Make
17 the appointments, then clean up the bylaws, as you have done
18 now, which is good. It addresses all the concerns. Bring it
19 back to the full ten members of the committee and get seven
20 votes. I think that's probably a better approach for
21 practicality and functionality of the -- of the bylaws.

22 CHAIR FISHER: Okay. Jeff?

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: I was wondering if it
24 would make any difference to those who abstained or voted no if
25 we did something that is often done in the CVC, which is to

1 adopt a one-year change with a sunset clause. Because, you
2 know, a lot of times, like our experimental devices, you know,
3 I don't see how this will work. I think it's a bad idea. But
4 could it work? I mean, what if for the year 2012 we try this?
5 I mean, and I'll look straight at the CHP. What if, you know,
6 we have an automatic sunset clause that we put into the bylaws
7 that we say this is just temporary for 2012? I think it works
8 with having a BAC representative on the committee for bike
9 issues. I don't see how this will work. But like a lot of
10 devices I've tried over my career, I'm willing to give it a
11 try.

12 But I would like to see it sunsetted so if it doesn't
13 work we don't have to have this debate again, it's just over.
14 Now if in a year we want to have this because it's worked well
15 and we want to extend it indefinitely, then let's have that
16 discussion. But we have no model for this. We don't want to
17 see the membership of the committee get out of control in terms
18 of over-expanding committee and how long these debates would go
19 on.

20 But would there be any change in your opinions if we
21 had this for the year 2012 and then sunset it, just to see how
22 it works, or whether it, in fact, adds something to the
23 committee?

24 CHAIR FISHER: Are you addressing that to Dwight or
25 John?

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Well, the people that were
2 either abstained or voted no, we need one more vote.

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Mr. Chairman, if on
4 the -- on the proposal that was made, I still do not see why
5 the committee today has to vote on something, because this puts
6 the committee members in a very awkward situation because the
7 committee unanimously voted for not expanding. Caltrans
8 director has all the legal authority to appoint new members, as
9 he should in the vehicle code. Let him do his appointments.
10 Let's pass that threshold and then bring the cleaned up bylaws,
11 and then we vote on it.

12 CHAIR FISHER: So is your suggestion that the
13 Caltrans director, our executive director, indicate the
14 expansion of the committee, and then if that is a done deal
15 then by directive then you bring to the committee the full
16 bylaws that reflect the executive directive or --

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: At that point -- at that
18 point my vote is on the details and whether this serves the
19 working of the committee. My vote is not on the structure and
20 membership of the committee. You're putting me in an awkward
21 position saying you vote on something you have already voted,
22 and I'm surprised at some of the members that already voted at
23 last meeting no, and now they're changing they're vote and they
24 say, yes, we are okay with expansion.

25 CHAIR FISHER: Well, what would it take for you to

1 vote yes? Would it have to be an executive directive to expand
2 the committee?

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: What -- what I'm saying
4 is that today's date -- today's vote is not needed. Caltrans
5 director has initiated a process soliciting applications.
6 They're going to go through a process. They are going to find
7 the two top qualified candidates and the two alternates. And
8 Caltrans directors is going to appoint those four members to
9 the committee. When they're appointed, next committee bring
10 the bylaws. You already have a new committee. You say, okay,
11 now the director has decided we have ten members, now adopt
12 your bylaws, how you're going to operate.

13 CHAIR FISHER: Yeah. Well, is that Caltrans -- is
14 that something Caltrans wants to do?

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: Well, that would be a
16 little more democratic, when you think about it. Because, you
17 know, two new members are going to have to operate under
18 whatever those rules are. And maybe they --

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: There you go.

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: And maybe they can't deal
21 with the, you know, three consecutive meetings.

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: There you go. There you
23 go. Then -- then we will hold at that time to the seven vote
24 and whatever works, works. But at this point I -- because
25 what's going to happen is that I still want to hear from the

1 members who -- not that they have to explain, but if you voted
2 no last time what has changed since last time to now, now that
3 you're still --

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: Well, to the -- I know that
5 everybody voted no, and the director used his prerogative and
6 said you're doing to have two new members.

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: So -- so --

8 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: But the question is: How
9 are you going to operate?

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Yeah. So let -- let the
11 director appoint those two members and then the whole committee
12 is going to decide on that bylaws.

13 SECRETARY SINGH: But that was an information item.
14 It was not an action item. But we -- I think I agree with you.

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: I believe that solves
16 some of the challenges that some organizations might have. And
17 that actually also establishes the precedent that the director
18 is the deciding authority on the membership number, not the
19 committee. So it's every clear that next time we want to
20 change the membership in the committee the committee is not
21 even going to discuss it. The director is going to decide how
22 many numbers he wants, what organizations he wants to
23 represent.

24 CHAIR FISHER: So in other words, the -- if you bring
25 back new bylaws to the committee it will make reference to the

1 fact that the expansion of the committee took effect per
2 executive directive, whatever, rather than by voted this --

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: I'm not sure if I can say,
4 you know, he's going to write out an executive directive. He
5 can point back to the letter, I guess, if he --

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: He doesn't need to issue
7 anything.

8 CHAIR FISHER: Well, he's -- he's got issues --

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: He can just appoint two
10 people.

11 CHAIR FISHER: Okay. Well --

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: He can just appoint two
13 people.

14 CHAIR FISHER: Okay. So I -- I guess this matter
15 will be brought back to the committee.

16 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: It will be brought back to
17 the committee at the next meeting.

18 CHAIR FISHER: With that, this item is closed for
19 now. We will take a ten minute break. Some of us have to
20 rearrange our flights. So let's meet back at 20 minutes to
21 3:00.

22 (Off the Record From 2:28 p.m., Until 2:44 p.m.)

23 CHAIR FISHER: May I ask all members to please set
24 yourselves. And because of the possible length of discussion
25 of item 11-1 we're going to take a couple items out of order.

1 We will go to item number 11-19. And then after that an
2 information item, item number 11-20.

3 Item 11-19 is a request for an experimentation with
4 the California Welcome Center destination sign. Wayne, why
5 don't you brief us on that.

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: Okay. Yeah. Yeah. One of
7 the, you know, generators of economy in California are the
8 California Welcome Centers. And we have a welcome center, and
9 typically they're, you know, they're located around the state,
10 and they're sponsored by chambers of commerce. And they have,
11 you know, a sign there, you know, as you approach, pretty close
12 to where you're approaching, and also at the exit ramp.

13 Well, we have -- one of the Welcome Centers is in El
14 Dorado Hills. And the have the -- the standard signing package
15 now. But they're suggesting -- and they're suggesting that
16 they put up an advance warning sign or advance sign for their
17 welcome center so that people, you know, when they start to
18 make a decision, should be go check it out or check -- you
19 know, they're visitors to the state, that they can, you know,
20 make their decision a little ahead of time.

21 We're really lucky here in that the welcome center
22 has a lot of before data. You know, they've been collecting
23 data on their -- on their visitor rates, and that sort of
24 thing. And what they're going to do is now be putting these
25 new signs out on an encroachment permit, and then collecting

1 after data to see if this effectively increases their
2 patronage.

3 And what we have today is have Debbie Manning who is
4 from the Chamber of Commerce in El Dorado Hills, I believe, and
5 Don Howe, and also Dana Jorgensen (phonetic) who are going to
6 be basically explain the proposal.

7 MR. POIMEROO: Thank you. My name is John Poimeroo,
8 and I am a consultant with the El Dorado Hills Chamber of
9 Commerce. I was deputy secretary in Trade and Commerce at the
10 time the California Welcome Center law was established. I
11 worked very closely -- which by the way is in BTH now -- I
12 worked for closely with Caltrans on the establishment of this
13 law and the signage initially.

14 When we first established these our intent was, and
15 actually the first Welcome Center signs were put at something
16 like 19 miles for Santa Rosa and 13 miles for Ontario, and over
17 time that's been reduced in some way. I don't know how that
18 came to be but it has. When we put in our proposal in 2009 for
19 the California Welcome Center at El Dorado Hills we proposed 13
20 miles or 15 miles, 2 miles, and the exit -- ahead of the exit.

21 The reason these distances have been proposed is that
22 in a traveler from another country or from another state, and
23 we've had all 50 states in the one year the Welcome Center has
24 been open, and 37 countries, visitors from 37 countries come to
25 the Welcome Center, we felt that -- that early notice was

1 needed, just like rest areas. In fact, safety rest areas are
2 identified at 25 to 30 miles away. In fact, I was up on
3 Highway 32 and saw one at 71 miles ahead of the rest area.
4 That's a big distance to alert somebody.

5 The reason we looked at welcome centers, they are
6 official state facilities. They're not -- even though they're
7 operated by the private sector they're done on a franchise-type
8 basis for the state. And the -- the chamber of commerce has to
9 actually pay for all the signs, their installation -- I'm
10 sorry -- has to pay for all the signs. It sounded like I was
11 talking into the mike there. It has to pay for all the signs,
12 their installation, their repay, maintenance, and so forth. So
13 the state has no cost on these signs.

14 In any event, when it did put in its proposal in 2009
15 it specified these distances. And so the proposal was approved
16 and accepted. Yet the third sign, this one at 15 miles, we're
17 very close to where it would be. It would just be on the exit
18 here, just off of Zinfandel Road, and then up near Missouri
19 Road coming from Placerville going the other way on Highway 50.
20 That was never -- those signs were never installed.

21 Well, we have a great opportunity that staff has
22 proposed which is to do an experiment now. Now that we've run
23 this welcome center for a year this committee can establish
24 whether, in fact, early notice of a welcome center does, in
25 fact, change the pattern of visitation into the welcome center.

1 And as I've said, we've seen a lot of people come into this
2 welcome center. And, actually, Debbie was saying earlier that
3 the economic impact on El Dorado County has been significant
4 from the standpoint that the transient occupancy tax, hotel
5 taxes have gone up substantially since the welcome center went
6 up at a time when we've had this economic upheaval.

7 So we can see that in previous studies done by the
8 state, by BTH, and the State Division of Tourism has proven
9 that welcome centers generate additional information about
10 where to travel in California and encourage people to travel
11 longer and to visit other places. Because what a welcome
12 center does is it gets someone into the -- into the context of
13 planning their California stay in a longer way. It's not just
14 a local visitors center, it's a California statewide center.

15 So the experiment would be we'd get these two signs
16 put up, and we'd see then whether, in fact, it has impact,
17 positive impact on visitation to those welcome centers. That
18 would clarify for the committee and for the state whether, in
19 fact, on future welcome centers whether early notice of this
20 kind is valued or not.

21 CHAIR FISHER: Thank you. Any questions for him from
22 members of the committee? Okay.

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Can I ask just a question
24 of clarification?

25 CHAIR FISHER: Yes, Hamid.

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: It's just for the
2 placement of these additional signs; right?

3 MR. POIMEROO: Yes, two signs. One here on Highway 50 off
4 the exit off of Zinfandel going east, and another just after
5 Placerville after the Missouri Road exit going west.
6 Obviously, the exact location Caltrans will determine. That's
7 actually less than the 15 miles we've put in the original
8 proposal, but it's a good distance, enough to alert people.

9 We found, actually, Debbie had said to me earlier
10 that people are going past the welcome center not realizing
11 they've already passed the welcome center, and having to turn
12 around at Cameron Park or trying to get answers from -- from a
13 small chamber there that has nothing to do with do with
14 statewide tourism and can't answer the questions.

15 So this will -- we think this will work for all
16 California Welcome Centers. Again, these are official state
17 facilities. They're not -- they're not anything other than
18 that. They are actual state facilities. So thank you.

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: Hey --

20 MR. POIMEROO: Yeah?

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: -- about how long do you
22 think you will find -- take you to, you know, realize that it
23 was a good idea to put the sign out there or not?

24 MR. POIMEROO: Well, we hope that those signs are up
25 for a long time, for one.

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: No, I'm saying, but if
2 you --

3 MR. POIMEROO: But I would say the staff can
4 recommend to us what they think is a reasonable length of time.
5 We have -- we keep track every day of statistics. And we have
6 an entire year's -- the state requires it -- we have an entire
7 year's tracking. We also track it by weather, what happened on
8 a given day, and all kinds of other factors.

9 I think the staff had proposed a two-year -- a two-
10 year test to see whether two years would be sufficient time to
11 determine. Of course, the -- the California Welcome Center at
12 El Dorado Hills has to pay to install those, so it would hope
13 that the signs would stay up longer. But a test of two years,
14 I think you -- you had said that should do it. We will provide
15 you statistics any way you want them, on a monthly basis, on an
16 annual basis, on a quarterly, any way you want it to see
17 whether, in fact, we've seen a change.

18 CHAIR FISHER: Thank you. Any other questions from
19 members of the committee? Seeing -- yes, Mike?

20 VICE CHAIR ROBINSON: Do you know for sure that
21 the -- that people stopping in that -- that you've achieved
22 pretty much what you're going to achieve over this year, that
23 it's not going to continue to increase in --

24 MR. POIMEROO: Yeah. We're seeing pretty -- of
25 course, the economy is such that it's changed travel patterns

1 greatly. And -- but the -- the -- the center right now is
2 doing exactly as we predicted it would in total visitation. It
3 was about 15,000 visitors a year, and we're -- we're achieving
4 that right now in a down economy. So we think we're stable at
5 this point. We don't know that there are other like
6 environmental factors that are changing that visitation.

7 VICE CHAIR ROBINSON: Well, that -- that was my
8 question was not only environmental factors but seasonal
9 factors, you're going to see different numbers. And I'm
10 wondering if you're really going to see something that you're
11 going to be able to attribute to advance signs versus something
12 that may be just attributable to increasing use of that type of
13 facilities.

14 MR. POIMEROO: Well, we've had one year. It's a good
15 question. We had one year of -- of practice here. And we see
16 pretty consistency in those numbers. We're now cycling through
17 into our second year. And so we're seeing, you know, seasonal
18 patterns to visitation and traffic, which the road sees anyway
19 because of winter, and so on.

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: Just a suggestion. You
21 know, we -- Caltrans, you know, Caltrans has a number of
22 traffic monitoring stations. And if they got one in the
23 vicinity of your -- of the welcome center it would be good to
24 just keep that data so you can see if, you know, if your
25 patronage is just going up with the traffic flow, you know, if

1 you're doing better than traffic.

2 MR. POIMEROO: Certainly, that's one other indices we
3 could use is whether traffic going off at that exit increases
4 because of the signs, and they're not just the traffic into the
5 visitors center but if traffic generally is increasing there.

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: And Caltrans hopefully can
7 help you, you know, the district.

8 CHAIR FISHER: Okay. Thank you. I'd like to give
9 any member of the audience an opportunity to comment on the
10 experimentation proposal if you wish to. Seeing none, that
11 will end public comment.

12 Any further discussion by committee members?

13 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Mr. Chairman, I think
14 this is an excellent idea. I support it and make the motion we
15 approve the request.

16 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: I'll second it.

17 CHAIR FISHER: I have a motion to approve. It's been
18 seconded. Any final discussion? All those in favor raise your
19 hand. Okay. Eight-zero. Thank you very much.

20 MR. POIMEROO: Thank you.

21 CHAIR FISHER: Okay. We'll go to item 11-20, which
22 is an information item. Wayne?

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: Oh, this is -- this is
24 the -- okay. This shouldn't be news to anybody. I think this
25 is basically, you know, the Federal -- FHWA sent out a letter

1 giving interim approval to -- for colored bike lanes, and also
2 for the special sign for electronic vehicle charging. And I
3 think we have followed up -- followed up with letters getting a
4 statewide approval. Is that right?

5 SECRETARY SINGH: Yes. We're just putting that
6 information item so agencies are aware, you know, we got
7 approval for the three new devices so they can use it if they
8 want to. So this is only an information item.

9 CHAIR FISHER: So if an agency wishes to use these
10 devices they simply notify Caltrans?

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: Right.

12 SECRETARY SINGH: The location, that's all.

13 CHAIR FISHER: Okay. All right. Well, thank you for
14 that information item.

15 We go back then to the item 11-1, which is adoption
16 of the final draft of the California --

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: This should go real quick.

18 CHAIR FISHER: -- MUTCD.

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: You know, for the -- for
20 the past two years we've -- for the past two years we have been
21 trying to bring our Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices
22 here in California into compliance with the new 2009 Federal
23 MUTCD. I don't think I need that. And anyway, Johnny is here
24 to let you know about his trials and tribulations over the last
25 two years and what he's been doing with his evenings.

1 MR. BHULLAR: All right. Thank you, Wayne. Johnny
2 Bhullar with Caltrans. Since everyone is in favor of making it
3 quick. At least I'll make the introduction of the item quick.

4 Now as most of you are aware, we had the four
5 workshops over the past year, year-and-a-half, when we went
6 through our initial -- our initial draft, which was back in
7 June. Since then we had our July meeting in Long Beach, and
8 also a two-day separate workshop in July at the City of Long
9 Beach facility where we discussed the initial draft. And I
10 believe there were 605 pages worth of comments on the initial
11 draft, which we have addressed. Of course, there were some --
12 some of them that we are going to address next year. But the
13 comments were at least discussed and we were in agreement in
14 the workshop that we were going to incorporate.

15 So the final draft of that we posted back in
16 September. We included all those comments. And some of the
17 items that were pending, we have been working with at least the
18 commentators.

19 Apart from that, once we posted the final draft in
20 September, it was posted on September 9th, and it had a 30-day
21 public comment period which ended on October 10th. And as a
22 result most of the comments are posted on the final draft, also
23 on line. We have about 50 comments. And there is a handout
24 that most of you should have. It's a big handout that I gave
25 this morning.

1 So this one has about 225 pages worth of comments on
2 the final draft. And out of the 50 comments that have been
3 submitted there are only 20 that I'm going to even entertain,
4 because on the other 30 they are either repetition of previous
5 comments or those are the -- those comments do not pertain to
6 the 2009 manual changes.

7 They pertain to the existing policy which, again,
8 just in summary, we decided, at least at our last meeting the
9 committee suggested that we were, starting next year, going to
10 create subcommittees on -- on the various parts and have
11 different people at least participate in those. Because a lot
12 of good comments were -- had been made on the existing policies
13 that we have. So there is a lot of good items and issues that
14 we need to clean up, but that's for next year. The only
15 comments that we are entertaining are the ones pertaining to
16 the changes that have been made.

17 So having said that, I will -- what I'll say is
18 I'm -- I'm looking for direction from the committee. How do
19 you want to address them today? Out of the 20 comments that I
20 want to discuss the bulk of them are going to be in two areas.
21 One is the Chapter 4E, which is the 3.5 feet and 4 feet per
22 second walking speed. The second big area is the Part 6, which
23 is temporary traffic control. That's where most of the
24 comments are. And then, of course, there are some others.

25 So do you want to go like comment-by-comment, or do

1 you want to do it as a group, one group, second group, and then
2 all the others as a third group?

3 CHAIR FISHER: Can you identify which comments you
4 were referring to, Johnny, that are worthy of further
5 discussion?

6 MR. BHULLAR: Okay. The way -- the ones that -- that
7 I want to discuss today, on the first page are the bottom two.

8 CHAIR FISHER: From Roberta and Jim Deluxe?

9 MR. BHULLAR: Yes. And then on the next page, which
10 is page 2 of 224, it's going to be the comments from Craig
11 Tackabery, then from Wendy Alfsen, Rob Sprinkle, Roberta
12 McLaughlin, Richard Haggstrom, Monica Suter, Michael Nunez,
13 Mari Lane, Karel Shaffer, Jerilyn Struven, Beth Thomas, both of
14 them under her name, Ralph Herman, John Cinatl, just a couple
15 of those in his group, Lourdes David, Christine Calabrese --
16 sorry if I mispronounce any names -- Richard Skaff, James,
17 Chon, Catherine Lampon, Eddie Tsui, and Michelle DeRobertis,
18 Trudy Ball. And then on page three, just one which is Kent
19 Tsuji.

20 These are the ones that either pertain to new
21 changes. And -- but most of them can be grouped into either
22 the work zone items, or they can be addressed by just the 3.5
23 to -- and 4 feet walking speed issue. That will take care of
24 the bulk of them. And then out of these only a few will be on
25 a case-by-case basis to address.

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Mr. Chairman?

2 CHAIR FISHER: Hamid?

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Since we are going to
4 address that chapter, I sent you an email, also, and cc'd Mr.
5 Fisher, as well, the AB 529 is now law. And --

6 MR. BHULLAR: That is on page -- first. If you look
7 at comment that I'm going to address, that is part of that. On
8 the very first page, from Robert McLaughlin, at the bottom --

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Okay.

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: -- that -- that is the
11 comment.

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: So we are going to have
13 the new language in place for January 1st as the law requires;
14 right?

15 MS. MCLAUGHLIN: Yes.

16 MR. BHULLAR: Okay.

17 MS. MCLAUGHLIN: We don't have the language today,
18 but we are going incorporate it.

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Yeah. Because -- because
20 there are a lot -- by the way, the way that that bill is
21 drafted it's so darn confusing. As much as we tried to make it
22 clear, still, a lot of people are confused about what it
23 exactly says. So that makes the language in the MUTCD so much
24 more important.

25 MS. MCLAUGHLIN: Right.

1 MR. BHULLAR: Since Hamid has brought that up, why
2 don't we just discuss it. And if Roberta can come u and just
3 let us know.

4 CHAIR FISHER: Well, let me ask a procedural
5 question.

6 MR. BHULLAR: Sure.

7 CHAIR FISHER: We have 24 comments. Would it be a
8 more efficient use of our time to try to categorize these
9 comments and discuss what new language has been proposed by
10 those who submitted the comments and try to group these, rather
11 than trying to discuss each of the 24 items? I'm just afraid
12 we wouldn't have the time to go through it.

13 MR. BHULLAR: And that was my intent. And that's the
14 reason why I was saying the bulk of them are either work zone,
15 which Gordon has a package ready, and the other is the 3.5 and
16 4 feet. That takes care of probably 16 to 18 out of the 25.

17 CHAIR FISHER: Then why don't we then, if it's okay
18 with the committee, discuss the speed limit matter, then
19 discuss the walking speed matter, and then go on to the --

20 MR. BHULLAR: The work zones?

21 CHAIR FISHER: -- temporary traffic control issues.

22 MR. BHULLAR: Okay. Let's do that.

23 MS. MCLAUGHLIN: Robert McLaughlin, Office of Signs
24 and Markings, Caltrans.

25 So it looks like at page 222 of our package, towards

1 the back, this was submitted past the -- the deadline, but it
2 was just recently signed by the governor. That would be
3 Assembly Bill 529, Senator Gatto sponsored. And was signed by
4 Governor Brown on October 7th.

5 In a nutshell, it takes affect January 1st, 2012.
6 Essentially the bill gives an additional option to
7 municipalities and/or the state, whoever is setting the speed
8 limits, in the case of using the 85th percentile in rounding.
9 So it will read -- read verbatim, and then we'll explain how
10 this will effect what we do.

11 "The bill would allow in cases in which the speed limit
12 needs to be rounded up to the nearest 5 miles per hour
13 increment of the 85th percentile speed, the department or
14 local authority to decide to instead round down to the
15 lower 5 miles per hour increment, but then the department
16 or local authority would not -- would be prohibited from
17 reducing the speed limit any further for any reason."

18 So it's kind of a case of mathematics. We currently
19 require that you round to the nearest and you are allowed an
20 additional five-mile-per-hour drop if it's justified in writing
21 and approved by a registered engineer.

22 This option allows you to round down if, in fact, it
23 had to go to the nearest -- next -- nearest increment. And if
24 you do round -- if you choose to go to the lower increment you
25 would not be able to use that additional five-mile-per-hour

1 drop. So essentially you could end up in the same location for
2 your speed limit. It just -- that first increment from the
3 85th percentile, you have the option of going below the 85th
4 percentile. The concern before was if you did that and then
5 you took the additional 5-mile-per-drop you could have as many
6 as nine miles per hours difference between the posted speed and
7 the 85th percentile. So it's -- it will not change any of the
8 other language, it just gives you an additional option.

9 And the -- the main concern here, as we all well
10 know, there is a perceived thoughts that speed limits were
11 being raised all over the state because of our new requirement
12 to round to the nearest five-mile-per-hour increment. We
13 did -- we did a preliminary survey. We didn't see a lot of
14 that happening. We didn't have a lot of responses. However,
15 this is kind of a feel-good kind of move to allow going to the
16 five-mile-per-hour increment if you, in fact, had to round up.

17 So if you want to assign some numbers to it, if you
18 do your 85th percentile and it comes out at 37.6 miles per
19 hour, normally you would round that to 40, which is the nearest
20 5-mile-per-hour increment. And then for other reasons,
21 conditions not readily apparently to driver, you could drop it
22 back to 35.

23 The option, instead of rounding up you could round
24 down to 35 your first step, but then you could go -- no longer
25 go the additional 5 miles per hour. So you would end up at 35

1 anyway.

2 CHAIR FISHER: So, Roberta, does the current language
3 say that you should round to the nearest five-mile-an-hour --

4 MS. MCLAUGHLIN: Shall round.

5 CHAIR FISHER: Shall. So will this language change
6 it to you may go up or you may go down?

7 MS. MCLAUGHLIN: No. It's an option. It will be
8 written as an option. If you were to have to go to the
9 highest -- the higher 5-mile-per-hour increment you have the
10 option of going to the 5-mile-per-hour below the 85th
11 percentile. However, you would not be allowed to go the
12 additional five-mile-per-hour drop which is --

13 CHAIR FISHER: So what do you envision, that it would
14 continue to be a shell, except for the option noted below?

15 MS. MCLAUGHLIN: Yes.

16 CHAIR FISHER: Okay.

17 MS. MCLAUGHLIN: Yeah. It's still going to be a
18 shall, because you still have -- with the shall you could round
19 up to 40, and for additions readily not apparent you could
20 round back down to 35 with the five mile additional drop.

21 CHAIR FISHER: Okay. I think the -- the thing to
22 keep in mind on this side, I think it was said, it was state
23 legislation.

24 MS. MCLAUGHLIN: Right.

25 CHAIR FISHER: So I think the task here is just to

1 make sure the language is consistent with the state
2 legislation, but also consistent with the previous sections of
3 the California MUTCD regarding speed limits.

4 MS. MCLAUGHLIN: Uh-huh. So we would not change that
5 current language, we would just add an additional option.

6 CHAIR FISHER: Okay.

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Do you need to site
8 unusual conditions or document the downward bump so you can do
9 it on a whim?

10 MS. MCLAUGHLIN: Not according to this legislation.

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Okay. So the language is
12 very clear so our court commission will understand that?

13 MS. MCLAUGHLIN: It will -- it will be put into
14 writing into the manual. And their same interpretation that
15 they use now for conditions not readily apparently will still
16 apply.

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: The language in the bill
18 is, actually, whether you like it or not, we drafted it.
19 Because that was part of the argument with the -- with the --
20 with Mr. Gatto's legislative staff. The further we tried to
21 clarify it the more confusing it became, because we had to go
22 and revoke a section of the vehicle code that automatically
23 allows you to downgrade and all that stuff. So the final
24 decision, and I remember exactly when that was made, was to
25 keep it short, brief, simple, and leave the nuances and further

1 explaining it to Caltrans, that they can do an MUTCD. They can
2 get in there and further explain what exactly it means.
3 Because a lot of agencies are now under the assumption that if
4 you round down you can't take any more five-mile-per-hour
5 credit, which is not true.

6 MR. BHULLAR: But you can.

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: You can. If you go from
8 37 to 35 you can still use conditions not readily apparently,
9 and if you have those conditions you can go from 35 to 30. But
10 if you are at 38, which now you must go to 40, you have the
11 option of coming down to 35 with no reason.

12 So that's the whole thing that needs to be clearly
13 explained in the MUTCD.

14 CHAIR FISHER: Roberta, if you have a 36-mile-an-hour
15 85th percentile speed, normally you'd run down to 35.

16 MS. MCLAUGHLIN: Correct.

17 CHAIR FISHER: Under this legislation would you be
18 allowed to take a 5-mile-an-hour further drop to 30 for
19 conditions not readily apparently?

20 MS. MCLAUGHLIN: Yes, you could. This legislation
21 only applies if you were to have to round up on that first
22 step.

23 CHAIR FISHER: Okay. So --

24 MS. MCLAUGHLIN: So instead of shall, rounding to the
25 next highest, you have the option of going to the next lowest,

1 but no additional five-mile-per-hour drop.

2 CHAIR FISHER: So I think we have to trust Caltrans
3 to develop the language --

4 MS. MCLAUGHLIN: Uh-huh.

5 CHAIR FISHER: -- that makes it all very clear --

6 MS. MCLAUGHLIN: Uh-huh.

7 CHAIR FISHER: -- the standard condition, except for
8 the option shown below, something like that.

9 MS. MCLAUGHLIN: Right. And we -- we would vet that
10 language through the committee. Because of the timeliness and
11 the -- and the timing of this -- the governor signing the --
12 the bill we didn't put in the effort to write the language.

13 Just a side note, it was -- the agency had wrote a
14 letter recommending vetoing the bill, and the governor made the
15 decision to sign the bill.

16 CHAIR FISHER: When you say vetted through the
17 committee, you mean offline between the --

18 MS. MCLAUGHLIN: Yeah. Right. Right.

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Yeah.

20 CHAIR FISHER: So --

21 MS. MCLAUGHLIN: In order to get it incorporated into
22 our new manual.

23 CHAIR FISHER: Right. Right.

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: One of -- Mr. Chairman,
25 if I can add, since the issue was brought up that there was

1 opposition to the signing, it's just that this -- this was not
2 maybe the best legislation, but it was the best compromised
3 legislation. Because the alternative was to pretty much
4 preempt the MUTCD on the speed limit issue and do it all
5 legislatively and go back to the old days, which created a lot
6 of speed traps in California. So this was a very
7 practicable -- is there such a word or I just made it up? Is
8 that it was a very practical approach that kind of addressed a
9 lot of local concerns and local issues.

10 MS. MCLAUGHLIN: Right.

11 CHAIR FISHER: Okay.

12 MS. MCLAUGHLIN: And the overall factor, you probably
13 won't see a big difference in posted speed limits. I'm not
14 sure what's doing that static. But it is a feel-good kind of
15 thing because a lot of locals can go down to the 5-mile-per-
16 hour below the 85th percentile.

17 CHAIR FISHER: Okay. So thank you for that, Roberta.

18 MS. MCLAUGHLIN: Okay.

19 CHAIR FISHER: Okay. Let's go now to the other large
20 item, which was on pedestrian walking speeds.

21 MR. BHULLAR: So before we move on the understanding
22 is that Caltrans is going to be able to put this language into
23 the final version of the issue, or what's the -- I just want to
24 be clear. Since we don't have any final language.

25 SECRETARY SINGH: So is the committee giving

1 conceptual approval to build language that we can --

2 MR. BHULLAR: As close to the assembly bill.

3 CHAIR FISHER: Yeah. I think we had given conceptual
4 approval to modify the standard per the option as shown below.

5 MR. BHULLAR: Okay. All right. All right. Now
6 let's get to the second part of our discussion on the comments,
7 and that will be the walking speed issue. So there a number of
8 comments.

9 First, I want to point out -- let's go to page 203.
10 Gordon, if you -- can you help us on the PowerPoint there? We
11 have the whole comments file there. So if you go to page 203.
12 And first we'll just go through a few of these comments so that
13 we understand.

14 So this is from California WALKS. Actually, their
15 real comment comes in on the other page. It's on page 205.
16 So -- so on page 204 on the bottom it says,

17 "In particular, California WALKS urges you to adopt the
18 FHWA MUTCD 3.4 feet per second walking speed for
19 calculating the pedestrian clearance time standard,
20 retaining existing California guidance for 2.8 feet per
21 second."

22 And then it says,

23 "To allow an optional four feet per second whenever an
24 engineering study can demonstrate that 15 percent of
25 pedestrians can not complete street crossing on walk cycle

1 before stop signal from beginning of walk cycle puts
2 vehicle conveniences above human life in violation of the
3 safety standard traffic engineers are sworn to uphold."

4 So most of you might have at least reviewed some of
5 these comments. But as you can see, this is a comment that's
6 opposing the 15th an the 85th percentile language that we have
7 put in.

8 Then on the same note, if I can go to page 202, and
9 this is from Rob Sprinkle, and let's see on the bottom there.
10 It says,

11 "The City of Santa Rosa supports the addition of the
12 California MUTCD allowing jurisdictions to determine
13 walking speed of between 3.5 and 4 feet per second
14 according to engineering study that documents that time is
15 sufficient to accommodate the walking speed of the 15th
16 percentile."

17 So here it is favoring what we have done. The
18 previous one was opposing it.

19 And then if I can go then next to page 193, and that
20 is a comment from Richard Haggstrom who is in the audience.
21 And on page 193 the comment is that the SHSP Challenge Area 8
22 Subcommittee submits the following comments,

23 "We strongly support the walking speed reduction from 4
24 feet per second to 3.5 feet per second in the new National
25 MUTCD. The California MUTCD should follow suit without

1 introducing the contradictory options.

2 "Specifically, we oppose the newly inserted language in
3 4E.06 that would reduce the recommended pedestrian
4 intervals by increasing walking speed from 3.5 to the 15th
5 percentile walking speed based upon engineering study.
6 This procedure could increase the walking speed as high as
7 the original 4 feet."

8 So I'll let you read the rest. But this way you can
9 get the tone.

10 And then the next one is on page 191 from Monica
11 Suter, City of Anaheim. And let's see, 193 -- no, 191. So the
12 comment is actually on the second page, which is 192. It says,
13 on the bottom paragraph,

14 "Further, we have one additional comment to Section
15 4E.056. In the new language for the pedestrian timing
16 section, is the new option on page 906 addressing only old
17 paragraph 8 or also the new paragraph 7? We believe this
18 new option language should also reference the new
19 paragraph 7."

20 Now let me see if I can find that out, the
21 paragraphs.

22 Gordon, can you pull up the 2009 MUTCD, Section 4E.06
23 there please? And will you look up paragraph seven and eight,
24 just to make sure?

25 MR. WONG: (Off mike.) Four --

1 MR. BHULLAR: 4E.06. 4E.06. If you look -- look at
2 paragraph seven and eight, just to make sure we understand the
3 comment.

4 So basically here it says, "The new language for the
5 pedestrian timing sections in our" -- it says -- the comment
6 there is, "The new option on page addressing only old paragraph
7 8 or the new paragraph 7 as well?"

8 I think that's a clarification that it does address
9 both. And we have the amended language in the new -- new --
10 online that we have posted. Let me see if I can find that.

11 (Colloquy Between Caltrans Staff)

12 MR. BHULLAR: So go to Section 4E.06. That's the
13 language we have posted. So, yes, it does apply to seven --
14 and what else -- and eight. Yeah. So the answer to that one
15 is, yes.

16 Then continuing on to page 147 of the comments. So
17 if we can go to comment on page 147 of the public comments that
18 we were looking at, 147. And just -- just type in 147 on the
19 page symbol.

20 SECRETARY SINGH: Everybody has a hardcopy.

21 CHAIR FISHER: 127?

22 MR. BHULLAR: 147.

23 SECRETARY SINGH: 147.

24 CHAIR FISHER: 147.

25 MR. BHULLAR: And basically here the comment is

1 regarding Section 4E.06. It says -- it's from Beth Thomas from
2 our Caltrans District 4, bicycle -- she's a pedestrian
3 coordinator. And the comment is,

4 "The final draft allows jurisdictions to time pedestrian
5 crossing signals with a walking speed of 4 feet per second
6 as long as engineering study shows it would accommodate
7 the walking speed of the 15th percentile pedestrian. This
8 proposal is inappropriate in that it would allow the
9 provision of facilities that are questionable in terms of
10 safety for nearly 1 out of 6 users. Moreover, the
11 percentage of people who can not negotiate these signals
12 and make it across safely in the time allotted will
13 increase as the baby boomer population ages."

14 And then on the same note, let me go to -- okay, I
15 think I'm going to leave that one. I think it's going to be
16 addressed in work zones, but it does pertain to similar issue.

17 So here is just a sampling of some of the comments
18 for or against the -- the language that we put in.

19 So, Gordon, you can bring back the online 4E.06 --

20 MR. WONG: 4E.06?

21 MR. BHULLAR: -- that we have posted there?

22 So basically here I just need direction as to should
23 we just keep the way it is, or based upon the comments should
24 we then just remove the language in blue text -- yeah, that's
25 fine on both, yeah, just go up a little bit -- or should we

1 remove this blue text and just go with the federal?

2 So that's what probably I'm asking the committee.

3 CHAIR FISHER: Okay. Well, I'd like to speak to that
4 item since I proposed the language that's shown in blue here.

5 We need to keep in mind as we discuss this item that there
6 already is a requirement that no one has proposed to change, a
7 federal requirement, that,

8 "The time to cross when you consider the walk and the

9 pedestrian clearance time must be sufficient to

10 accommodate someone walking at 3.0 feet per second."

11 So that would stay in. There is no change there. So

12 all signals, when you consider the "Walk" and the flashing

13 "Don't Walk," have to be sufficient to accommodate someone

14 traveling at 3.0 feet per second.

15 What this language would do is give us a little bit

16 of flexibility to time signals at another speed, but only by

17 setting a very high standard. That high standard would mean

18 that you must accommodate for the pedestrian clearance time 85

19 percent of the users who are crossing the street, just for the

20 pedestrian clearance time.

21 The prior language that had been submitted by

22 Caltrans said, in effect, you can modify the time between 3.5

23 and 4.0 based on an engineering study, but it didn't tell you

24 what criteria you should use. So what we tried to set here is

25 a very high threshold that you must accommodate at least 85

1 percent of the users for the 15th percentile pedestrian. And
2 keep in mind, when you add in the "Walk" and the flashing
3 "Don't Walk" time you're going to be accommodating well over 95
4 percent of the users at 3.0. So the idea here was to set a
5 high standard.

6 One of the things that prompted this in the City of
7 L.A. was we're building a light-rail system, and the detector
8 were set back such that it would accommodate 4.0 feet per
9 second. By the time the new Federal MUTCD was being written we
10 could see the new direction that it was going in the direction
11 of 3.5 feet per second, we wanted to have some justification to
12 keep the train detectors where they were because initiating a
13 change order would have been hundreds of thousands of dollars.
14 So we said, can we have some flexibility, but if we have
15 flexibility can we maintain a high standard. And that was the
16 motivation behind it, just to give local jurisdictions a little
17 bit of flexibility but maintain a high standard. And that's
18 why this was proposed.

19 Now in the studies we've conducted and in the ITE
20 study that -- upon which was undertaken as a result of these
21 discussions we have found that the 15th percentile speed at the
22 20 locations that we sampled in the city was about 4.1 feet per
23 second. Certainly, we intend to go to the 3.5 wherever we feel
24 is appropriate. But all we're asking for here is a little bit
25 of flexibility based on the information we had, not over-design

1 it, but also to set a high threshold.

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Do meet the 3.0 --

3 CHAIR FISHER: Yeah.

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: -- feet per second,
5 including the "Walk?"

6 CHAIR FISHER: Yeah. We would automatically meet
7 that for -- in our jurisdiction for any street 80 feet or less
8 in width. And even if we have this flexibility here we would
9 still have to satisfy the 3.0.

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: So your train detector is
11 probably going to move down --

12 CHAIR FISHER: Yeah.

13 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: -- to a 3.0?

14 CHAIR FISHER: Yeah.

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Mr. Chairman?

16 CHAIR FISHER: Hamid?

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: I was asked this specific
18 question last week in the Orange County ITS Roundtable, which
19 is like all the traffic engineers from the cities and the
20 county over there. The question was that -- and I'm glad you
21 brought it up -- they said do I have to go and establish this
22 for every single intersection? But L.A. has like 4,300, 4,500
23 traffic signals. And if you go and you do -- and you do 20,
24 which is less than half a percent, it's like 23 percent of --
25 of all your signals, does it mean that if a jurisdiction is not

1 a jurisdiction that has a couple hundred intersections, if they
2 go and they do study of 5 or 6 intersections is that going to
3 be adequate ground to go to a higher? Or the question was that
4 should be go and every single intersection that we want to go
5 to four feet, you have four feet per second, we have to do a
6 study of pedestrian walking speed at that intersection?

7 And I said, "I'm not going to say a word until I take
8 it to the committee. It's a legal question anyway."

9 I advised them to check with their legal in-house
10 staff.

11 But what is like the understanding of the committee?
12 When we give this kind of flexibility do they have to go
13 establish the parameters for every single intersection? Or in
14 your case, like you did 20 out of over 4,000 and you say that's
15 good enough for me?

16 That was the question --

17 CHAIR FISHER: Well --

18 MR. BHULLAR: -- that was posed to me and I said, "I
19 don't know."

20 CHAIR FISHER: Yeah. As a practical matter you
21 probably can't do studies at every signalized intersection.

22 What we tried to do was to look at areas of the city
23 and to -- to try to -- you know, Hollywood, Downtown, Century
24 City, you know, South L.A., those areas. We still have some
25 more to go.

1 But also I should mention that we have a practice of
2 wherever we have a complaint regarding signal time not being
3 sufficient we'll go out there and we'll do a study. We've done
4 it at senior centers. And the question is, then, what criteria
5 do you use? If we were to use 3.5 feet per second but the 15th
6 percentile speed was 3.2, I think morally we're obligated to
7 time it at 3.2. So we just wanted to set a threshold, a
8 criteria that should be achieved, a goal, but to give us a
9 little bit of flexibility.

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: And that's good then.
11 The reason I brought it up, because I promised that group that
12 I'm going to bring it up, so it's going to be reflected in the
13 minutes of the Devices Committee since we are taking verbatim
14 minutes. I don't know if it has any legal standing whatsoever.
15 But at least somebody can go back and say, hey, this is how the
16 committee felt at that time. That was their interpretation of
17 the MUTCD. But it may help if you think appropriate to add
18 some language to that, in fact, so that cities know. Because
19 this is not really practical to go and do a pedestrian survey
20 at every single intersection, that they understand that a
21 sample size of the signals is going to be adequate. I don't
22 know if you want to add your own language.

23 MR. BHULLAR: Well -- Johnny Bhullar -- it's an
24 agenda item. So pretty much whatever the committee decides.
25 If you want to add, modify, you are pretty much at liberty to

1 do whatever the committee suggests.

2 CHAIR FISHER: Well, we -- we're supposed to get
3 public comment on this; right?

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Yeah.

5 CHAIR FISHER: Okay. Why don't we get public comment
6 on this item.

7 MR. HAGGSTROM: Thank you, Johnny, for reading part
8 of my comments. I'd like to read the rest of them. This is
9 Richard Haggstrom.

10 And what I want to point out is a quote from the
11 *Federal Register*. It says,

12 "The FHWA recognizes that the recommended use of slower
13 walking speeds in calculating pedestrian intervals will in
14 some cases slightly reduce vehicular capacity, and for
15 highway agencies with large numbers of signalized
16 intersections it will require considerable time and effort
17 to retime signals. However, the FHWA believes that the
18 research has clearly demonstrated," and I've looked at the
19 research and I agree with them, "that the need to reduce
20 walking speeds to accommodate a larger percentage of the
21 walking public and that the safety needs of pedestrians
22 for adequate crossing time must outweigh potential
23 vehicular capacity in tact."

24 And that's from the *Federal Register*. That's the
25 FHWA talking. And you know, I think I speak for pedestrian

1 advocates everywhere when I say, you know, we solidly agree
2 with that.

3 As far as I know the 85 percentile criteria is based
4 on nothing. There is no research or scientific basis for it
5 whatsoever. You may be interested in knowing that this has
6 been studied in detail for quite a few years, that the average
7 walking speed of a woman 65 years or old, the 85th
8 percentile -- the 15th percentile, actually, speed is 3.06 feet
9 per second. So if you adopt this new policy you may find that
10 the 85th percentile is 4.0 feet per second. But what about the
11 65-year-old woman?

12 So what you're doing is you're talking about entire
13 categories of people who aren't being considered, even if you
14 adopt the unscientific, unfounded 15 percent criteria. This is
15 not applied science. This is not engineering, in my opinion.

16 So I -- on behalf of the Strategic Highway Safety
17 Plan Pedestrian Safety Committee, we strongly recommend it. We
18 stick with the proposed federal language. Thank you.

19 CHAIR FISHER: Richard, can I ask you a question?

20 MR. HAGGSTROM: Sure.

21 CHAIR FISHER: Under the example you cited where the
22 65-year-old woman walks at 3.0 feet per second --

23 MR. HAGGSTROM: Uh-huh.

24 CHAIR FISHER: -- would you also acknowledge, though,
25 that the requirement, when you consider the "Walk" and the

1 pedestrian clearance time to be accommodating a 3.0 feet per
2 second would more than accommodate that person?

3 MR. HAGGSTROM: (Off mike.) Yeah. I would like
4 to --

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Richard, before you
6 speak, can you --

7 MR. HAGGSTROM: Oh. Personally, I would like to see
8 that demonstrated as to how it would work out. If -- if going
9 with the faster pedestrian walking speed doesn't matter at 3.0
10 feet per second from, you know, like one point in the
11 intersection to another point in an intersection, I would like
12 to demonstrate -- see it demonstrated why that 3.0-whatever
13 walking speed or how it's even -- even possible. I'm not
14 convinced.

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Well, I mean, you
16 understand the concept is that when we're just timing the
17 flashing red, plus yellow, plus all red, we set that based on
18 one standard. But if we use the standard seven seconds of walk
19 time -- so what we're saying is if you step off the curb the
20 instant it's changing the flashing "Don't Walk" you can get
21 all the way across the street during that period.

22 MR. HAGGSTROM: Right.

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: But if you step off at the
24 beginning of the walk you've got seven more seconds.

25 MR. HAGGSTROM: Oh, I thought --

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: So what we're doing is
2 we're making sure that regardless of how long we set the
3 flashing "Don't Walk," that if you add in the "Walk" time then
4 you've got a crossing speed at 3.0 feet per second.

5 MR. HAGGSTROM: Oh, I see. I thought you were
6 talking about the fact of -- that there was some offset to like
7 the base of the truncated domes or something like that.

8 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Right. Well, and there
9 was a rule that that's measured from six feet back from the
10 sidewalk.

11 MR. HAGGSTROM: Yes. I --

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: So not only are you --

13 MR. HAGGSTROM: I thought that's what you were
14 referring to.

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: -- at the current phase,
16 but you're six feet back from the sidewalk or from the
17 pedestrian push button, you know, to cross the street.

18 MR. HAGGSTROM: Yes. Yeah. I understand the
19 concept. And -- and somebody who comes up to a "Walk" sign,
20 whether it's an old one or a new one, has the right to start
21 walking and has to be accommodated.

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Mr. Chair?

23 CHAIR FISHER: Hamid?

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Mr. Haggstrom, I have a
25 question in terms of like your 85th percentile argument, and I

1 understand. But what is like -- are you -- you don't have a
2 problem with the percentile approach anyways because it is
3 impossible to accommodate all pedestrian and all walking speed
4 because we don't know what's the lowest walking speed.
5 Somebody may walk at like three inches per hour. We can't
6 accommodate that. I'm exaggerating the point. So all these
7 studies we do based on a certain percentile and we say, okay,
8 we accommodate these many percentile.

9 So you're saying that you're not comfortable with the
10 85th percentile, you want it to be raised, or you have a
11 problem with the over -- with the statistical approach that we
12 are doing with pretty much everything in traffic?

13 MR. HAGGSTROM: I don't have a problem with the
14 statistical approach. I do have a problem with the way that --
15 and I think I'm reflecting the FHWA's language here with the
16 way that vehicular capacity is sometimes elevated over
17 pedestrian safety.

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: No. I give you that.
19 What I'm saying is that --

20 MR. HAGGSTROM: And -- and I think that you're right,
21 you can't accommodate everybody all the time. There has to be
22 some sort of cutoff. But I think that the 85th percentile of
23 everybody is -- well, it's two things. Number one, it's not
24 based on anything. And number two, it's very difficult to
25 obtain. A pedestrian count is not the same as a vehicular

1 count. You can't just like put out a tube in the street or put
2 somebody during the peak hour, because you don't know when the
3 pedestrian peak hour is unless you have somebody standing out
4 there all day long. So I have my doubts as to whether any of
5 these studies could even be conducted properly --

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: No, no, no. The
7 studies --

8 MR. HAGGSTROM: -- or if they would be.

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: The studies, we pay
10 \$350,000 and ITE did the study. The studies are very accurate,
11 very scientific. The studies actually put videos at the
12 intersections. They record three days, not one day. They have
13 72 hours worth of pedestrian volume at the 20 intersections
14 that he mentioned. So the studies are done very
15 scientifically. They're very accurate. You get a very good
16 sample size and you can actually measure the fraction of a
17 second because it's a video. You go to 100ths of a second when
18 the pedestrian steps off and when he actually reaches the other
19 side. I've seen them. They're very, very accurate.

20 But my question was that do you think that the
21 85th -- accommodating 85th percent of the pedestrians is not
22 enough, that we have to go like 90th or 95th, or you have a
23 problem with the overall percentile approach?

24 MR. HAGGSTROM: Well, to me one of the main
25 motivations of doing this is accommodating older pedestrians.

1 Even if you do a study, as you propose, which, you know, I
2 agree can be done well, but it is very labor intensive -- just
3 because you take video doesn't mean it's all counted. That
4 means somebody has to actually watch the video.

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: That's why it costs
6 \$350,000 to do.

7 MR. HAGGSTROM: Okay. And -- and -- but it's a
8 moving target. Because we have an aging population, and we
9 have a whole challenge for our entire transportation
10 infrastructure of taking note of that, of changing our s signs.
11 You're all very familiar with that. We've made many, many
12 changes to how -- how we work our traffic control devices. And
13 this is one thing that is changing, even as we speak. And our
14 population is aging and -- and they require more walking time.

15 I personally, now I don't know if Anne would approve
16 of -- with -- agree with me, but if you can find some way of
17 determining the 85th percentile of elderly women, that would be
18 fine. That would be fine with me. And I think you will find
19 that it's well below 3.5 feet per second in all cases.

20 CHAIR FISHER: I'd just like to point out for the
21 record that the 85th percentile has some basis in statistics.
22 It is just slightly more than one standard deviation from the
23 norm, so it does represent the usual pattern in the general
24 population.

25 MR. HAGGSTROM: Right. However, it does not

1 necessarily have any basis in pedestrian safety, which is where
2 I'm coming from.

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Well, Mr. Chairman, since
4 I promised my colleagues at the ITS Roundtable -- ITS
5 Roundtable in Orange County and they're waiting for the
6 committee also to make a decision on that or at least have a
7 conversation, the ITE national study, is that an adequate,
8 reliable source for doing a higher? Because that study, the
9 20-city study that you mentioned, it establishes pedestrian
10 crossing that have a pedestrian countdown signal, the 85th
11 percentile is at 4.2 seconds.

12 So but the question was that is a national study like
13 that, can that be used in a small city that doesn't have
14 resources like Laguna Hills or Laguna Beach? Can they just use
15 that study, since these studies are very, as -- as Richard
16 mentioned, they're really expensive to conduct?

17 CHAIR FISHER: Well, I think the intent here was to
18 put a burden on the local agency to do a study and, two, to set
19 the standard high.

20 Now you brought up the question, do you need it at
21 every signalized intersection, you know, maybe we could modify
22 to say that if an engineering study at representative locations
23 documents that it's sufficient, blah, blah, blah, that might be
24 what we are clarifying, that you've got to do one in the area
25 but you don't have to do one at every single signalized

1 intersection.

2 MS. GERAGHTY: I find the discussion troubling in
3 that you have national research, and maybe you need all the
4 studies that have been done that Richard talked about, that
5 suggest that this is the appropriate way to go. And yet what
6 I'm hearing from you is that you want to make it possible to
7 deny 15 percent of the people the ability to walk comfortably
8 across the street. And that seems to fly in the face of what
9 you said earlier, that you were considering the needs of all
10 people.

11 I know that we have the percentiles in the speed
12 issue, but this doesn't stop people from getting someplace.
13 When you're adopting something affecting crossings you're
14 stopping people from being able to walk. Right now, because of
15 our multi-lane arterials, many people don't walk. And we know
16 that we need to make our streets safer.

17 I just -- it boggles my mind that you would even
18 consider, when you have a national body that's supporting, with
19 research, a way to go, that you would consider making it more
20 lenient. And I -- it just boggles my mind.

21 MR. WONG: Please state your name.

22 MS. GERAGHTY: Excuse me. Thank you. Anne Geraghty,
23 Walk Sacramento, and SHSP Challenge Area 8.

24 MR. HAGGSTROM: You know -- Richard Haggstrom -- how
25 come nobody's talking about the -- this push button for extra

1 time option? Because that's in there. That's part of the FHWA
2 proposal. If you need extra time put in a push button and you
3 can request it. You can do four feet per second. You know,
4 it's just accommodating those people who can't make it across.
5 That's all it is.

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: But -- and we are right
7 now.

8 CHAIR FISHER: Are there any other members of the
9 public that would like to speak to this issue?

10 MS. PRICE: I'm Lindell Price, a member of the
11 public. And I'd like you to keep in mind what Richard
12 Haggstrom just said in terms of there being an option for the
13 push button for people who need extra time, and that many of
14 the people who don't have an option other than walking or
15 walking and transit because they may be unable to drive are
16 many of the same people who need the additional walking time to
17 get across the street.

18 CHAIR FISHER: Is there anyone else from the audience
19 that would like to speak to this matter? If not we'll close
20 the public comment period on this.

21 I initiated this proposal. I'd like to amend it
22 slightly. Under option it would say,

23 "If an engineering study at representative locations
24 documents that it is sufficient to accommodate the walking
25 percent of the 15th percentile pedestrian."

1 Based on the comments that I heard I would propose
2 that amendment.

3 SECRETARY SINGH: And the amendment is -- can you
4 read it again?

5 CHAIR FISHER: On the option?

6 SECRETARY SINGH: Yes.

7 CHAIR FISHER: I'll -- I'll read the whole thing.

8 "A walking speed between 3.5 and 4 feet per second may be
9 used for the pedestrian clearance time if an engineering
10 study at representative locations documents that it is
11 sufficient to accommodate the walking speed of the 15th
12 percentile pedestrian."

13 So we would insert the words "at representative
14 locations."

15 So procedurally, Johnny, how do we proceed? Will we
16 need --

17 SECRETARY SINGH: We will address all the comments
18 and then vote.

19 CHAIR FISHER: Six votes? Four votes? What -- how
20 does it work.

21 MR. BHULLAR: No. I think on these items, because
22 this is a big item, I do want to at least, rather than -- I
23 mean, it's up to actually --

24 SECRETARY SINGH: What I'm saying, we can address all
25 the comments, and then vote at one time.

1 MR. BHULLAR: But then we will get into other items,
2 and then it will be hard to come back.

3 CHAIR FISHER: Yeah.

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Let's vote while this is
5 fresh in our minds.

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: And you may have votes on
7 one item. You may not have votes on --

8 CHAIR FISHER: I thought we resolved the speed limit
9 issue.

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Okay.

11 CHAIR FISHER: Simply, we wanted to address the
12 walking speed issue.

13 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Okay.

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: So to follow up on
15 Johnny's comments, do we want to make a formal motion, or do
16 you just want a consensus opinion so that you get a gauge for
17 do the majority of people support the proposed language?
18 Because if someone makes a motion to go with the language as
19 amended by John just now -- and I do want to point out that
20 this still relies on the 3.0 feet per second. So we're not --
21 because the federal standard says that that's the overall
22 guideline. So that's still in there, 3.0 feet per second.

23 And that, I guess, we as traffic engineers, we, for
24 example, get every collision report in the city, whether it's a
25 vehicle, a bicycle or a pedestrian. If we ever have a

1 pedestrian problem we specifically look at what was the cause
2 of that collision. The provisions always allow us to
3 increase -- this may be the citywide standard, but it doesn't
4 keep us near a school, near a senior center from further
5 increasing the pedestrian clearance time where we know we have
6 slower pedestrians.

7 So I don't want it to sound like we don't care about
8 pedestrian safety. Because one of the things that you have to
9 realize is in the federal timing book and guidelines and in the
10 ITE book on traffic safety it says that if you use -- because
11 when a pedestrian is crossing the street, the apposite
12 direction isn't going at the same time, the perpendicular
13 movement. And the -- so you have to realize that there's
14 multiple, even, pedestrians or cyclists that if you make the
15 "Walk" and "Don't Walk," the whole pedestrian too long you
16 increase the likelihood that a pedestrian in the other movement
17 is going to actually not wait for the walk and start crossing
18 on red. And that's what was documented in the Federal Signal
19 Timing Guidelines and the ITE Timing Guidelines, is the longer
20 you make people wait you actually create a safety problem
21 because people start getting frustrated and they -- they don't
22 want to wait and they start crossing on red.

23 So I would want to see the actual collision
24 statistics you're citing. But right now we're not having a
25 problem, and I haven't seen a problem in the cities I've worked

1 with that pedestrians are being hit at signalized crosswalks
2 because the walk is too short. I haven't seen that
3 demonstrated.

4 So I would support what's being proposed and would
5 move that we adopt this as proposed with John's amendment.

6 CHAIR FISHER: Okay. I had closed the public comment
7 period.

8 MS. GERAGHTY: Okay.

9 CHAIR FISHER: We can't get into a back and forth.

10 MS. GERAGHTY: Can we just stand?

11 CHAIR FISHER: We can't allow everyone to express his
12 or her views. But if you have a very short comment then we'll
13 entertain it.

14 MS. GERAGHTY: Well, just in response to what you're
15 saying -- and, actually, this is a good example of the
16 dialogue, when we can only speak a short amount of time it --
17 it limits our dialogue.

18 If that is the case, what -- what you were just
19 saying, why wouldn't the approach that was proposed by FHWA
20 take that into account? Why would you need to have the 85th --
21 15th percentile if -- if it meets that? Why do -- why do you
22 have to have that option?

23 MR. HAGGSTROM: May I make a short comment, or is
24 somebody going to answer?

25 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Well, what we're talking

1 about is using the FHWA standard as the default standard. If
2 somebody wants to invest the hundreds of hours and thousands of
3 dollars to do a local study, that's another issue. But absent
4 that data we're following what's in the manual.

5 MS. GERAGHTY: And yet -- but -- but by putting that
6 in there you're encouraging a direction by local government to
7 take on expensive studies, to prove -- and you're supporting a
8 15th percentile. You're supporting the fact that people won't
9 get across the street.

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Well, you should have
11 pointed out the --

12 MS. GERAGHTY: And -- and right now you talk about
13 collision reports. I'm sorry, I have my concerns. You talk
14 about collision reports. What you're not hearing about is
15 people that don't walk because they can't get across the
16 street. So you're not addressing the traffic needs of the
17 walking public. You're only addressing the ones that are
18 actually walking.

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: I mean, this is just --

20 CHAIR FISHER: Well, just let me offer a comment.
21 Certainly we can look at our studies. But I know Orange County
22 has invested heavily in studies to determine the appropriate
23 time for bicyclists. And as part of their comprehensive
24 retiming of signals throughout Orange County, they're also
25 looking at the needs of pedestrians. I would like to think

1 that if they are willing to invest significantly in determining
2 what works best for bicyclists and what meets the needs of
3 pedestrians that we should at least allow them the opportunity
4 to use that data intelligently, rather than saying whatever
5 data you collected it doesn't matter, just blindly use this
6 number.

7 MS. GERAGHTY: I -- well, all I'm saying is many
8 people can't get across the street. We know that from all
9 kinds of research that Richard understands. You're not dealing
10 with the people who have made the decision that they can't get
11 across the street because it takes -- you know, they can't make
12 it all the way across.

13 CHAIR FISHER: Okay. Again, we had closed the public
14 comment period. Richard, if you have a very short comment,
15 we'll --

16 MR. HAGGSTROM: Yeah. Just -- just a short one.

17 CHAIR FISHER: -- we'll consider it.

18 MR. HAGGSTROM: I'd just like to remind everybody
19 here, since you all claim to be familiar with pedestrian
20 accident statistics, about 11 percent of traffic fatalities
21 nationwide are pedestrians. In California it's about 19
22 percent. We are quite a bit worse than the rest of the
23 country. And to create a standard for California where we
24 would have shorter pedestrian intervals than the rest of the
25 country is exactly the opposite of what California needs.

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Mr. Chairman?

2 CHAIR FISHER: Hamid?

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Mr. Chairman, the
4 statistics are being read into record, and we need to put it in
5 context. When you say 11 percent and 19 percent, what are the
6 percentages of those people getting hit in signalized
7 intersections due to lack of adequate clearance time? The
8 majority of the pedestrian accidents are due to jaywalking at
9 mid-cross locations where there are no protections.

10 So if you say that 11 percent of people are getting
11 hit at signalized intersections you're implying that all these
12 accidents are happening because we don't have adequate signal
13 time, that doesn't help the dialogue. We need to be precise,
14 look at the science, look at the facts. And I agree with you
15 completely. But just for the purpose of clarification I want
16 to go on notice that these are not people getting hit at
17 signalized intersections because there is short signal time.

18 CHAIR FISHER: Are there any other comments --

19 MR. HAGGSTROM: Can I respond to that?

20 CHAIR FISHER: -- from committee members before we
21 vote on this item?

22 SECRETARY SINGH: I'm sorry, what did you say?

23 CHAIR FISHER: Are there any other comments from
24 committee members before we vote on this item? John?

25 COMMITTEE MEMBER KELLER: Question in terms of

1 defining the 85th and the 15th percentile pedestrians. I -- do
2 we know what difference it makes in terms of the timing if we
3 look at that -- the 90th percentile or the 95th percentile? In
4 other words, do we have an idea of what that tail of the
5 distribution looks like?

6 CHAIR FISHER: I think it depends on the site
7 specific data that one collects. If you look at the cumulative
8 curves they become asymptotic as you get from the 85th to the
9 90th to the 95th percent level. In other words, you're
10 accommodating a majority, then a super majority, then a super-
11 super majority. I think statistics would tell you. I haven't
12 committed to memory what two standard deviations. I'm not sure
13 if it's 956th percent of 99 percent, but it -- it gets
14 asymptotic up there.

15 Dwight, did you have a comment?

16 COMMITTEE MEMBER KU: Yes, sir. I had a question.
17 Mr. Haggstrom referred to the push button that we had discussed
18 earlier today. Would it be appropriate in this location in the
19 blue area to reference that, either as a parenthetical if
20 additional time is necessary, but there's reference to the --
21 the push button language that's in there?

22 CHAIR FISHER: Well, that language is already in the
23 MUTCD.

24 MS. MCLAUGHLIN: Paragraph nine supports the recent
25 change. It's in paragraph nine.

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER KU: Thank you.

2 CHAIR FISHER: Okay. Any other comments from
3 committee members? Okay. Seeing none, I'd like to bring this
4 matter to a voice vote starting with Mr. Robinson.

5 VICE CHAIR ROBINSON: I vote aye to approve as
6 modified.

7 CHAIR FISHER: Okay. John?

8 COMMITTEE MEMBER KELLER: I'm -- I will abstain.

9 CHAIR FISHER: Okay. Dwight?

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER KU: Aye.

11 CHAIR FISHER: Wayne?

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: I'll abstain.

13 CHAIR FISHER: I will vote aye.

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Aye.

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Aye.

16 COMMITTEE MEMBER PRESLEIGH: Aye.

17 CHAIR FISHER: Okay. Six ayes, two abstentions. No
18 disapprovals. Okay.

19 So I guess the final issue before us is issues
20 regarding temporary traffic control.

21 MR. BHULLAR: Yes. So the motion passes and we will
22 make those changes.

23 CHAIR FISHER: Yes.

24 MR. BHULLAR: Gordon, now I'm going to lump most of
25 the comments that pertain to Part 6, which is temporary traffic

1 control. So Gordon is going to -- in a summary, he has a few
2 pages that he's going to go over. So Gordon.

3 MR. WONG: Gordon Wong from Caltrans. Basically, I
4 just summarized all of the changes in the comments and drafted
5 this document showing everything that was -- that came in. And
6 if you -- we're going to go through it real quick. And if you
7 have questions then or you want to look for who made the
8 comments then we can take care of it.

9 I don't think I have a recording microphone. Is that
10 a problem?

11 COURT REPORTER: I can hear you.

12 MR. WONG: Okay. The -- the first one that came in I
13 think was from Jane Boland (phonetic), L.A. County. It's
14 regarding the stop-slow panel that we adopted. And then we
15 stated that the stop-slow panel should be a minimum of six feet
16 above the pavement. And the comment was that when it's on the
17 staff panel --

18 MS. MCLAUGHLIN: Do we have this printed up or is it
19 just --

20 MR. WONG: No.

21 MS. MCLAUGHLIN: -- on the screen?

22 MR. WONG: That's why I'm --

23 SECRETARY SINGH: Well, this is a summary of the
24 various comments.

25 CHAIR FISHER: By the way, how many comments do we

1 have on Part 6?

2 MR. BHULLAR: There were about eight or nine.

3 CHAIR FISHER: So we're going to discuss each one
4 individually?

5 MR. BHULLAR: No. That will take care of all of
6 them.

7 CHAIR FISHER: Oh. Okay.

8 (Colloquy Between Caltrans Staff)

9 MR. WONG: All right. So if the committee members
10 can kind of turn around. And basically we have another one,
11 but I think it's too hard to see, on the back wall. Is it too
12 hard to see?

13 MR. BHULLAR: That's okay. That's fine. Let's go.

14 MR. WONG: Okay. So basically the comment came in,
15 said what if a stop-slow panel is put on a short staff and a
16 human is holding it in the air, it's going to be very tiring
17 and almost impossible to keep six feet at all times. So the
18 wording was added, six feet above payment is only going to be
19 applied when it's mounted on -- on a rigid staff. And this was
20 a 2009 change in --

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: May I make -- may I make
22 a suggestion? Instead of "rigid" you may want to use the word
23 "fixed." Rigid is an engineering term.

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: Well, if you carry it
25 around --

1 CHAIR FISHER: (Off mike.) Yeah. It's a different
2 meaning.

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: So it's not technically
4 fixed either.

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: But some of them are
6 flexible.

7 MR. WONG: I mean, on a long staff.

8 COMMITTEE MEMBER KU: On a bigger staff, yeah.

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Because they are on
10 plastic poles, posts, and they're not technically rigid.

11 MR. WONG: And then the next one was a 2011 draft
12 change. What happened was we combined the chapter on portable
13 delineators, tubular markers and channelizers because they are
14 referred to as the same thing. And we separated because we
15 thought they were different things altogether.

16 And -- and this third box supports what is what. The
17 draft language was not -- tubular markers are -- that are
18 fixed, cemented to the pavement, are commonly referred as
19 channelizers. Tubular markers that are not fixed to the
20 pavement, stabilized by using weight bases, are commonly
21 referred as portable delineators. And that was not true. The
22 channelizer was referred to as the pinch top kind that's shown
23 on the current figure. So that was clarified. And would you
24 like me to read the new language? The clarified language is,
25 "Cylindrical tubular markers that are fixed, cemented to

1 the pavement are commonly referred as tubular markers.
2 Non-cylindrical tubular markers are commonly referred to
3 as channelizers. Tubular markers that are not fixed to
4 the pavement but stabilized by using weight bases are
5 commonly referred as portable delineators."

6 And this situation is a little unique because this is
7 in the Caltrans spec book, which is used by many public
8 agencies, as well, and that's what the official name that was
9 given. And that has been used in California for a long time
10 and it just stopped.

11 And then -- no questions? Then we move to the next
12 one.

13 CHAIR FISHER: Well, Gordon --

14 MR. WONG: Yes?

15 CHAIR FISHER: Do you have a drawing or a figure that
16 says this is a channelizer, this is a stabilized marker, this
17 is a portable delineator?

18 MR. WONG: Yes, we do. Yes.

19 Johnny, do I have that open.

20 MR. BHULLAR: What's that?

21 MR. WONG: Oh, never mind.

22 (Colloquy Between Members and Staff)

23 MR. WONG: Here is the picture of channelizer. It's
24 tubular at the base and hangs flat on the top. And here is
25 tubular marker that is cemented to the pavement.

1 What we don't have a figure is a portable delineator.

2 Any comment?

3 CHAIR FISHER: Well, do we need a drawing that shows
4 the portable delineator with the weighted base?

5 MR. WONG: The comment is do we need a picture of a
6 delineator with a weighted base. I don't think it will hurt.
7 Does the -- does the committee member agree with that, or
8 should we revisit at the end?

9 And the next -- the next comment was from, again,
10 James -- I believe it's from L.A. County. There is a conflicts
11 within our manual between the two sections, the section 6F.82,
12 floodlights, and 6G.19, temporary traffic control during
13 nighttime hours. And the California notification is from the
14 federal standard of 5 foot candlelights for the night for
15 general purpose to ten foot candles, and that's based on the
16 construction safety order of Cal-OSHA regulations. We made the
17 change in Part 6F, but we did not make the change 6G. So --
18 and that came -- comment came in, so the -- the -- the new
19 language in 6G.19 has been change to delete the five foot
20 candle reference and left only the ten foot candle reference.

21 Also, the -- during the floodlight section it says
22 that the standard was added by California, saying when night
23 work is being performed floodlights shall be used in
24 illuminating the work area. And we're, like we say in the
25 bylaws, we're the committee of caring for traffic control

1 devices, and we don't really -- shouldn't be managing night
2 work lighting. And that standard shouldn't go away because
3 that's still under Cal-OSHA standard. So basically in the 6G
4 the same standard is referred to Cal-OSHA's regulations. So
5 basically this standard from 6G is copied into 6F to make
6 then -- to just basically to put the standard -- we're really
7 copying the standards from one section to the other.

8 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Mr. Chairman?

9 CHAIR FISHER: Yes, Hamid?

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: On that on one I would
11 like to pick on what he said. This is -- to my knowledge, and,
12 Johnny, correct me if I'm wrong, this is -- to my knowledge,
13 and, Johnny, correct me if I'm wrong on this, this is the first
14 and the only time that we are making a reference to a street
15 lighting level in the MUTCD. And I agree with what he said,
16 that the street lighting level is not a traffic control device
17 issue. This is a work safety issue. This is -- that doesn't
18 even belong here.

19 MR. WONG: For one reason it belongs here is this is
20 also the same standards to illuminate flagger stations for Part
21 6. And -- and flagger stations or flaggers themselves are
22 traffic control devices. And -- and that's why if this
23 standard stays in it will be a good idea to -- to -- for the
24 general public to -- in order for them to see our flaggers.

25 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Yeah. Yeah. That one I

1 agree, you know, that the flaggers are a control device. We
2 even get to the micro-managing of which hand he can have the
3 stop sign and which hand he can have a flashlight. We had a
4 discussion on that one. But -- but if you establish a minimum
5 lighting level for the full construction work area is that the
6 traffic safety or a traffic control issue? That's my thing.

7 CHAIR FISHER: Well, where is the language that says
8 that?

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Where you are saying the
10 minimum -- go back to the first one.

11 MR. WONG: This is the current language in our
12 standard, "construction work lighting shall be as per
13 construction safety order 1532 of the California Code of
14 Regulations" --

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Yeah. But if you go --

16 MR. WONG: -- so on and so forth.

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: If you scroll up -- you
18 scroll up, one page only. Okay. I think it's right there.

19 MR. WONG: Which part?

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Is says, "An average
21 horizontal illumination of ten foot candle can be adequate for
22 general activities."

23 SECRETARY SINGH: That's the federal.

24 MR. WONG: This is the federal language.

25 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Yeah. But is that even a

1 traffic control issue?

2 CHAIR FISHER: Well, what the feds often do when we
3 have a related device, even though it's not a traffic control
4 device per se, they usually handle that as a support statement
5 that says this is generally accepted illumination. But without
6 a requirement there's no option, shall or should. The
7 requirement stated here is simply a support statement that
8 makes reference to some related device. That's often how the
9 feds handle it.

10 MR. WONG: Moving on, the next comment came in on
11 regards to an editorial kind of error. What happened was
12 Figure 6H-1, typical application, one, the federal figure is
13 very similar to the California figure. So in order to
14 eliminate the many California figure while maintaining the
15 manual we decided to revert back to the federal manual, and
16 then we're still deleting the reference to the California.

17 And this is another comment that came in. This is a
18 figure that I am currently working with Mr. Fisher, Chairman,
19 on the next version. And the City of San Diego commented that
20 the proposed figure was missing this -- the first right turn
21 only pavement markings, so that was added to the figure. And
22 this is still not a final figure and I'm still working, but
23 this only showing that we're taking care of the comment that
24 came in.

25 CHAIR FISHER: Yes. I'd like to comment on that.

1 MR. WONG: All right.

2 CHAIR FISHER: I mean, I had submitted per the
3 committee at the last meeting what I thought the figure should
4 look like, and it was consistent with, I think Figure 3B.18
5 California that showed the required signs there. And all I ask
6 is that this figure be consistent with the signing and markings
7 shown in Figure 3B.18 California.

8 MR. WONG: Johnny, is 3B.18 on this?

9 MR. BHULLAR: You want the new one or the --

10 MR. WONG: The existing.

11 MR. BHULLAR: Existing 2010?

12 MR. WONG: Yes.

13 MR. BHULLAR: Okay.

14 MR. WONG: 3B.

15 MR. BHULLAR: That is 3B.18.

16 MR. WONG: This says 3B.12, 3B.13, 16, 18.

17 CHAIR FISHER: Well, then maybe I meant 3B.12,
18 whatever the one that shows the --

19 MR. WONG: 14, 13, and still 13.

20 CHAIR FISHER: Yeah, that one.

21 MR. WONG: Oh. Okay.

22 CHAIR FISHER: Yeah.

23 MR. WONG: The sign under discussion is this
24 particular sign, "Right Lane Turns Right Ahead." This
25 particular sign is a California sign, 73A (phonetic),

1 parenthesis California. And the chairman proposed to use this
2 sign instead of the federal sign which says, "Lane Ends, Merge
3 Left." And I have two problems with using the "Right Lane
4 Turns Right Ahead" sign, one being this is -- on our sign spec
5 it's only a black and yellow sign.

6 Another problem is for the -- for the sign policy,
7 this sign is reserved for conventional highway only. It's not
8 to be used on expressways. And I don't know when that came
9 about. And I'd like to see that policy changed so we can use
10 it in this drawing. But without changing that sign policy I'm
11 reluctant to use that sign here.

12 CHAIR FISHER: I'll comment on that. The manual says
13 that any sign that shall or can be orange in a temporary
14 traffic control situation. The illustration that we have for
15 the "Blocked Lane Ahead" is that you're mandating the right
16 lane to the right, this is conditioned. I mean, we already
17 have this is in the standard drawing. All I'm asking is that
18 we replicate it so the conditions where the turn lane is
19 blocked ahead.

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: And what is the problem
21 with that? What's the problem with your request?

22 MR. WONG: That I'm denying his request because the
23 sign policy says this sign is not to be used on expressway
24 settings. And what I have found is that there is a Marina
25 Expressway in L.A. that has the exact same configuration. And

1 if this traffic control is put in then we would use, following
2 the chairman's proposal, we would use right lane right --
3 "Right Lane Turns Right Ahead" sign. And in that situation on
4 an expressway that should sign should not be used. So I said I
5 would like to see that sign policy changed before we utilize it
6 in a typical -- and I prefer -- and in general I prefer to keep
7 both signs as the federal proposal as much as possible, unless
8 we have a particular reason to use a California sign.

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Gordon, which sign says
10 shall not be used in expressway condition?

11 MR. WONG: That is 73A (phonetic), the "Right Lane
12 Turns Right Ahead" sign.

13 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Okay. So those two black
14 on yellows, the -- you say that your policy says that they
15 shall not be used on expressway conditions?

16 MR. WONG: No, it doesn't say you shall not. It
17 just -- in the California MUTCD it says this sign is for
18 conventional highway, and that the "Thru Traffic Merge Left"
19 is -- can be used on conventional highway and expressways.
20 It's in part --

21 CHAIR FISHER: I submitted the temporary traffic
22 control drawings, and I was drawing my experience with urban
23 conditions. People would come to me to say we need a drawing
24 that shows how you properly track the right turn lane.

25 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: I understand, you know,

1 at the higher speed you don't want to say "Right Lane Turn
2 Right." You want to say

3 CHAIR FISHER: Well, at the higher speeds you have --

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Because higher speed, you
5 want to encourage people --

6 CHAIR FISHER: What this -- what I'm illustrating is
7 a signalized boulevard.

8 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Yeah.

9 CHAIR FISHER: There are plenty of illustrations that
10 show highway application and expressways. But the context of
11 the drawings is curves and turns at signalized intersections.
12 So it was not intended to reflect the features of an
13 expressway.

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: So --

15 CHAIR FISHER: It's an undivided highway.

16 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: So it is called an
17 expressway, but all practical purposes it's an arterial?

18 CHAIR FISHER: What we illustrated is an arterial.
19 It's an undivided highway.

20 MR. WONG: And here is the sign policy on this
21 particular sign. It says,

22 "On conventional highways the 'Right Lane Turns Right
23 Ahead' sign or the other ones, 'Thru Traffic Merge Left'
24 sign, should be used in advance of 'Right Lane Must Turn
25 Right' sign."

1 And it says right on top,
2 "On expressway the 'Thru Traffic Merge Left' may be used
3 in the event of right -- 'Left Lane Must Turn Right'
4 sign."

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: And I understand the
6 reason for that. You've got people going at 50 miles an hour,
7 you don't want to say "Right Lane Must Turn Right." It's too
8 late. You want to tell them "Merge Left." But the case that
9 John was talking about, that seems to be like a conventional
10 highway to me.

11 MR. WONG: It -- it depicts a conventional highway,
12 but it does not exclude to use this typical on an expressway.
13 So we would have partitioners to use the sign and not knowingly
14 already following the manual and already violating the manual.

15 CHAIR FISHER: I think the important thing here is
16 that when you entrap someone to turn right when they don't
17 normally have to turn right because of the obstruction ahead --

18 MS. MCLAUGHLIN: John, use the microphone.

19 CHAIR FISHER: -- that you should give them a
20 warning. First you warn them once, you warn them twice, then
21 you mandate the turn. And the input I have from those involved
22 with temporary traffic control is that those warnings are very
23 important to make sure they the message, they prepare to turn,
24 and they don't inadvertently blow through the intersection,
25 colliding with the construction ahead.

1 I acknowledge that for an expressway condition your
2 package of signing and traffic controls will be somewhat
3 different. But an expressway is a divided highway with some
4 crossings, probably only a handful of traffic signals. That
5 wasn't what we intended to display in this situation though.

6 MR. WONG: I -- in concept with where the chairman
7 was using the "Right Lane Turns Right Ahead" sign, I just want
8 to see that sign policy changed before we use the sign.

9 MR. BHULLAR: Gordon, can -- can we change -- this is
10 Johnny Bhullar. Can't we change the sign policy that is
11 normally there?

12 MR. WONG: Yes, we can.

13 MR. BHULLAR: Let's do that.

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Yeah, let's do that.
15 I don't see the problem.

16 MR. WONG: Okay.

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: And I understand Johnny's
18 suggestion.

19 MR. WONG: And then the next change is another
20 discrepancy in our manual, that on object markers, and for the
21 Type P marker it says, "72 issues in total length, and see
22 notes." But the notes actually says, "The bottom of the marker
23 is normally mounted one foot above the pavement surface." It's
24 actually a note for Type R only, but the same notes refers to
25 both. And I checked Part 2, the same drawing does not have any

1 notes. So therefore the notes have -- it's not doing much
2 where it is. So if I simply delete it, it takes out the
3 discrepancy.

4 The next is the last one. This is a mistake that was
5 commented in the last drawing, was a comment that's on our
6 draft that I forgot to address is that the California figure is
7 missing the signal head on the top drawing. It only shows two
8 signal heads, whereas the federal figure shows all eight, and
9 that was added back in.

10 And that concludes all the Part 6 comments, Mr.
11 Chairman.

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Everyone in favor, say
13 aye.

14 CHAIR FISHER: Does any member of the committee want
15 to comment further on this item, other than what we've already
16 mentioned? Is there anyone from the audience who would like to
17 make a comment?

18 MR. WINTER: Just a question. This is Bill Winter.
19 One of our comments was with respect to Part 6H, the use of the
20 arrow boards. And --

21 MR. WONG: Oh, yes. That is -- okay. Good. The
22 chairman is here. County of L.A. is represented and City of
23 L.A. represented. What the comment is about is that -- let me
24 address from right here. Basically, in last CTCDC meeting that
25 an agenda item was approved and it was sponsored by the

1 chairman, and taking out all arrow boards for lane closure as
2 optional. It required every lane closure by every agency to
3 have -- to use an arrow board. And a comment from L.A. County
4 reverses this particular modification to the manual. They
5 would like to see every situation "optional" is added in for
6 the manual for Part 6. Caltrans is neutral on this particular
7 object -- subject. Because in our standards we require a arrow
8 board for every lane closure. So -- and that's already done
9 with our specifications for contracts and our practice. So
10 we -- we -- we would like just to see what is the local
11 agencies' opinion on that and we can modify the manual either
12 way.

13 And this is a good time to discuss it because that
14 was a 2011 draft change because that was a resolution from an
15 agenda item.

16 CHAIR FISHER: I thought what we had proposed at a
17 previous meeting was to eliminate the word "optional" where it
18 showed arrow board because there was specific language as to
19 when you should use an arrow board. You don't always have to
20 use it, but if volumes are high, speeds are high, etcetera,
21 which is explained in the text, then that requires the use of
22 an arrow board.

23 And so what we had proposed at a pervious meeting was
24 to strike the word optional. And I think we said see section
25 whatever that specified when it is to be used to alert the user

1 that he needs to see the requirements that prescribe their use.

2 MR. WINTER: If you look at Section 6F.61, I think
3 that's where the comment is coming from here. It says it's --
4 in the Federal MUTCD. I think in the -- in the Federal MUTCD,
5 the 2009 Federal, I think in that section it says that it's
6 optional. But I guess what I'm hearing here is that probably
7 at the July meeting, I don't know if it was intended to change
8 that section, 6F.61, or just the figure that -- that had the
9 word "optional" in it.

10 CHAIR FISHER: I think what we had proposed at the
11 previous meeting was that we strike out the word optional and
12 make reference to the section. Because there is guidance
13 language that it says,

14 "An arrow board should be used to advise motorists of
15 approaching traffic of a lane closure along major multi-
16 lane roadways in situations involving heavy traffic
17 volumes, high speed, limited sight distance," etcetera,
18 etcetera, etcetera.

19 So we thought it was a little bit more than just an
20 option. So we just said, "See Section 6F.51 -- 6F.61," rather.

21 MR. WINTER: Right. And the way it's worded is
22 "should." Yeah. I have it in front of me.

23 MR. WONG: Basically, under the direction of the
24 chairman we delete every -- every -- in every typical word it
25 says "arrow board as typical" was striked out by blue text --

1 by blue lines.

2 SECRETARY SINGH: So are saying "See Section 6F.61?"

3 MR. WONG: No, we do not.

4 SECRETARY SINGH: So we need to then --

5 CHAIR FISHER: You've preserved 6F.61 as it's shown
6 here in the Federal MUTCD?

7 MR. WONG: Yeah.

8 SECRETARY SINGH: So then we need to put that, "See
9 Section 6F.51 -- 61."

10 MR. WINTER: And again --

11 MR. WONG: Do you want to add that into the notes or
12 do you want to add it into the figure?

13 SECRETARY SINGH: Then -- then we are adding too many
14 notes. Each figure -- most of the figures have that.

15 MR. WINTER: Yeah. I mean, I think our comment was
16 really to just continue to show this as an optional item. But
17 I see here we're -- if it's -- if the federal level is saying
18 should that creates a dilemma or a disconnect.

19 SECRETARY SINGH: Gordon, is it possible then to add
20 to the arrow board a note, "See Section 6F.61?"

21 MR. WONG: For instance, as a package, starting at
22 typical 21, the flag tray was taken out, replaced by our arrow
23 board, and that now says "optional."

24 SECRETARY SINGH: Well, we can do it if we want.

25 MR. WONG: 422, the arrow board does now say

1 "optional."

2 MR. BHULLAR: That's -- Gordon, yeah, we should add
3 "See Section."

4 MR. WONG: And for Part 3, where the federal drawing
5 shows "optional," for the California manual the "optional" is
6 crossed out.

7 MR. BHULLAR: Okay. So we'll put the "See Section."

8 MR. WINTER: And I think that's our point, is in the
9 federal manual they continued to show the word "optional," even
10 though the text of 6F.61 says that it's a should.

11 MR. BHULLAR: It's an oversight.

12 CHAIR FISHER: I think it would be cleaner and give
13 jurisdictions more flexibility if where we crossed out
14 "optional" we just put in parenthesis "See Section 6F.61." And
15 then the local agency could decide if the --

16 MR. BHULLAR: If we need --

17 CHAIR FISHER: -- criteria here apply or not.

18 MR. WINTER: Right. Because in some very short
19 duration work zones it's going to be very cumbersome to roll
20 out an arrow board, and there may be reasons why you wouldn't.
21 And again, to be able to document those reasons or have an
22 understanding of when you wouldn't, I can -- I can go along
23 with that.

24 MR. BHULLAR: Bill, yeah, in that case Chapter 6G and
25 Section, I think, 6G.02 does allow you to not have an arrow

1 board and the full spectrum of signs in those type of
2 situations.

3 SECRETARY SINGH: So maybe we need to put some kind
4 of reference.

5 MR. BHULLAR: Okay.

6 SECRETARY SINGH: Not everybody (inaudible) of 6G.

7 MR. WINTER: Yeah. And it may be -- it may not just
8 be referencing 6F.61 because those other circumstances that
9 Johnny says may be why the feds have shown this as optional in
10 the actual figure. And that's our -- just our point, is there
11 are occasions when it would be optional, in our minds, and we
12 would want just that -- that same kind of flexibility.

13 CHAIR FISHER: So are we in agreement that wherever
14 we show an arrow board in situations like this in parenthesis
15 it would say "See Section 6F.61?"

16 MR. WINTER: Or the other, if Johnny thinks there is
17 another --

18 MR. BHULLAR: Well, no. The other section is 6G.02.
19 But it wouldn't be appropriate in every case because it's
20 applicable to all the typicals then.

21 CHAIR FISHER: Okay.

22 MR. BHULLAR: And basically what that says is that if
23 you are going to have a short term meaning, left, one -- I
24 think I forget exactly, is it one hour or up to three hours
25 special situation, in those cases Section 6G.02 does go into

1 the narrative where it explains you don't have to even set up a
2 closure. You don't need any devices. All you do is, in that
3 type of situation, less than one hour, you go in and you just
4 compensate for that with strobe lights and signs and devices on
5 the (inaudible).

6 MR. WINTER: Well, with that kind of understanding I
7 don't think you have to have all that in the note. But I -- I
8 understand that.

9 MR. BHULLAR: But at least the reference to 6F.61
10 where we can put that on all the typicals wherever we show an
11 arrow board.

12 MR. WONG: My question is do we want to show under
13 every arrow board or are we going to only replace that text
14 with the word "optional" where federal shows optional, and
15 under every arrow board?

16 MR. BHULLAR: Optional would not be a true statement
17 in every case if we don't have it as optional for the policy.
18 So I think using optional would be wrong because in certain
19 situations it's a guidance, not an option. So just the
20 reference to the section I think is the best.

21 MR. WONG: So we want to add that text under every
22 arrow board showing in every typical?

23 MR. BHULLAR: If that's what's needed, yeah, it can
24 be done. I don't see any harm in that.

25 MR. WONG: Okay. No. I just want to clarify what's

1 the --

2 MR. BHULLAR: Yes.

3 MR. WONG: -- intent of the committee.

4 MR. BHULLAR: Yeah. Okay. Are we --

5 MR. WONG: And --

6 MR. BHULLAR: -- getting closer to Part 6, the issues
7 we have discussed so far?

8 MR. WONG: There is one more thing, it's rumble
9 strips, but I don't know if you're going to talk about that.

10 MR. BHULLAR: I'm going to get to that.

11 MR. WONG: Okay. The rumble strip is part of, in a
12 bigger scale, of a different part, as well. So I'm going to
13 lead that to Johnny.

14 CHAIR FISHER: Okay.

15 MR. WONG: And also County of L.A. brought in many
16 other good comments, like changes to Part 6A, and that's all
17 incorporated already into the CTCDC agenda item. And I have 17
18 ready to go for cleanup, the entire Chapter 6.

19 MR. BHULLAR: We'll, at the next meeting, do that.

20 MR. WONG: And we -- so I'm going to take Johnny's
21 word on that. So basically we -- we can't go home until all my
22 17s are approved or rejected, one or the other.

23 MR. BHULLAR: So, Devinder, are we okay with these
24 items? Do we want to vote or --

25 SECRETARY SINGH: For what?

1 MR. BHULLAR: For all those --

2 SECRETARY SINGH: Yeah. Yeah. Yeah.

3 MR. BHULLAR: Okay.

4 SECRETARY SINGH: John? John?

5 CHAIR FISHER: I'm sorry. What?

6 SECRETARY SINGH: Do we want to vote on these areas?

7 CHAIR FISHER: We've had discussion on a number of

8 items in Part 6. I'd like to take a voice vote on it. All

9 those in favor, say aye?

10 VICE CHAIR ROBINSON: Aye.

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER KELLER: Aye.

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER KU: Aye.

13 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: Aye.

14 CHAIR FISHER: Aye.

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Aye.

16 COMMITTEE MEMBER PRESLEIGH: Aye.

17 CHAIR FISHER: Opposed? Abstentions?

18

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: I'm going to abstain on

20 this one.

21 CHAIR FISHER: Pardon?

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: I'm abstaining on this.

23 CHAIR FISHER: Knowles is abstaining.

24 MR. BHULLAR: All right.

25 CHAIR FISHER: Johnny, just a point of clarification.

1 There were, at the last minute, some drawings that were still
2 being revised and worked on. I know we're getting to the
3 finish line on those. But would it still be possible to share
4 those with the sponsor of those items?

5 MR. BHULLAR: Definitely. And I was hoping that
6 by -- by today we should have had them to Gordon and Jennifer.
7 I think they were working on those.

8 And I believe they're not ready yet, Gordon?

9 MR. WONG: The only one I have is this particular one
10 I show. The rest are still under work. And the only
11 outstanding is still from the CTCDC agenda items sponsored by
12 Mr. Chairman. So I will continue to work with Mr. Chairman to
13 complete those. And --

14 MR. BHULLAR: So then we do agree, before we put it
15 into the manual we will make sure that the sponsor has reviewed
16 them and they are okay with them?

17 MR. WONG: Yes.

18 MR. BHULLAR: Okay.

19 MR. WONG: And like earlier we said we will change
20 the sign policy on that one particular sign, and that will be
21 drafted, as well, and then put it in. And I guess we'll --
22 the -- the word is based that the committee members just have
23 to trust me and the chairman to do the right thing. And if you
24 see something not --

25 MR. BHULLAR: Well, if they're going to deny the

1 request then how can we --

2 MR. WONG: No. I'm always open to sign change --
3 policy change. I just --

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: You were doing just fine
5 until you said "trust me." You know, that's not --

6 MR. BHULLAR: All right. In the interest of time, if
7 we can move on.

8 CHAIR FISHER: I think we can work toward that
9 together. Thank you.

10 MR. BHULLAR: All right. So now I'm going to just
11 work through some of the comments that I want to discuss.
12 Otherwise, the bulk of the other comments we have already
13 either addressed or previously discussed, or they are not the
14 2009 changes.

15 CHAIR FISHER: Johnny, do you think we can --

16 MR. BHULLAR: Yes.

17 CHAIR FISHER: -- time ourselves to be done before
18 five o'clock?

19 MR. BHULLAR: Yes.

20 CHAIR FISHER: Okay. Thank you.

21 MR. BHULLAR: So -- but that -- the next one, I want
22 to turn to page 194, which is comments regarding a rumble
23 strip. And if Roberta can probably come up, basically, I'll
24 let her summarize it.

25 We are -- just in general, the 2009 MUTCD has moved

1 over from the physical feature of the rumble to strip to rumble
2 stripe. So the difference is only an additional E. But rumble
3 strip and stripe become two different things.

4 MS. MCLAUGHLIN: So as Johnny -- Roberta McLaughlin,
5 Caltrans.

6 As Johnny has indicated, the new federal manual is
7 dealing with the markings, not the actual bump in the pavement.
8 And then just recently Caltrans has issued a new TOPD 11-04
9 that talks about our policy for the indentation in the
10 pavement. So a lot of the language -- and I'm looking at a
11 black and white copy here -- but a lot of the language that was
12 blue language has now been removed, and there will be
13 references to this TOPD. And a significant change, I'm looking
14 at page 199 of our handout, the Table 3J-101, which is a
15 California table, will be removed. And that will be dealt with
16 in the TOPD.

17 The markings above that will remain because, again,
18 we're talking about markings, and it's talking about the
19 markings in relationship to the little rumble -- rumble strips.

20 So that's the gist of what the changes -- so
21 essentially, a lot of the blue language that was in the
22 previous manual will now be removed because it's being handled
23 by a TOPD. And the markings part, which is part of the federal
24 language, will remain.

25 CHAIR FISHER: So is it a rumble strip marking or a

1 rumble stripe marking?

2 MS. MCLAUGHLIN: I believe it says "rumble strip."
3 If you look at the top of page 199 the figure is labeled
4 "Examples of Longitudinal Rumble Strip Markings." So the -- so
5 the rumble strip is still a strip. The marking is a
6 longitudinal rumble strip marking. But it's -- it is a stripe.
7 It is most likely an edge stripe. And it's talking about the
8 relationship between the edge stripe and the rumble strip.

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: One question, Mr.
10 Chairman. The -- this is probably a draft, but typically when
11 we eliminate a table we just do an X.

12 MR. BHULLAR: Yeah. We will be -- actually, this
13 will be totally removed out of the manual.

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Yeah. Rather than
15 dashing out every single --

16 MS. MCLAUGHLIN: Right. Right. Right. Right.
17 Yeah. A lot of this stuff is going.

18 CHAIR FISHER: A question, Roberta. Since we're
19 creating a new category or marking --

20 MS. MCLAUGHLIN: Excuse me? Say again?

21 CHAIR FISHER: Since we are creating a new category
22 of a pavement marking --

23 MS. MCLAUGHLIN: We are not. The feds are.

24 CHAIR FISHER: Since we are including it in the
25 manual --

1 MS. MCLAUGHLIN: Correct.

2 CHAIR FISHER: -- wouldn't we have to then define
3 what it looks like in Part 3A?

4 MS. MCLAUGHLIN: No. It is an edge stripe. It's a
5 normal marking. What they're talking about is where the
6 marking is -- if you look at the example, sometimes the marking
7 is on one side of the rumble strip. Sometimes the rumble strip
8 is on top of the marking or, actually, if you want to be
9 technically correct the paint or the thermal plastic goes over
10 the top of the rumble strip which is the center -- the center
11 illustration. And then the -- the C is where you have your
12 barrier stripe down the -- the two yellow parallel lines with
13 the rumble bar -- a rumble strip.

14 CHAIR FISHER: But what type of line is it?

15 MS. MCLAUGHLIN: It's a center line, your normal
16 center line stripe.

17 CHAIR FISHER: Okay.

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: The way that the figure
19 shows, at least it implies that the rumble strips or the,
20 whatever you call them, go right on top of double-double
21 yellow.

22 MS. MCLAUGHLIN: That's what's shown here, yes.

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: That's what they're
24 showing.

25 CHAIR FISHER: A double yellow or an edge bar.

1 MS. MCLAUGHLIN: Yes.

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Okay.

3 MS. MCLAUGHLIN: And those are standard applications.

4 We're not changing the stripe itself. That illustration is

5 just to show you where it's in relationship to the rumble

6 strip.

7 CHAIR FISHER: Okay. Thank you.

8 COMMITTEE MEMBER KELLER: Mr. Chairman?

9 CHAIR FISHER: Yes, John?

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER KELLER: A question for Roberta.

11 You mentioned the TOPD. And I don't see it specifically

12 referenced here, and I would prefer it that way.

13 MS. MCLAUGHLIN: That language hasn't been changed.

14 If you look at the handwritten note on, well, let's see, page

15 195, and actually that's probably not done correctly. We would

16 be referring to the TOPD. And the TOPD, also, back -- refers

17 back to the MUTCD.

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER KELLER: Right. So the TOPD is

19 policy for Caltrans. So it doesn't seem entirely appropriate

20 that the MUTCD would be dictating to everybody what rumble

21 strips and stripes look like.

22 MS. MCLAUGHLIN: Well, again, the rumble strip is not

23 considered a traffic control device.

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER KELLER: Well, I would say --

25 MS. MCLAUGHLIN: So --

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER KELLER: -- precisely for that
2 reason, as well.

3 MS. MCLAUGHLIN: So the -- the intent here was the
4 manual wasn't going to go into the particulars about the rumble
5 strip and the bumps in the road, and that we were retaining how
6 you place the markings next to it.

7 And regarding the TOPD, I believe it does apply to
8 all public roadways. But if somebody can --

9 MR. BHULLAR: (Off mike.) Well, it's only a
10 placeholder until we put it into the manual. So -- but if
11 the -- if the TOPD has an X that does not go into the
12 California MUTCD, then it doesn't apply.

13 MS. MCLAUGHLIN: Okay. Yeah. So -- so the question
14 is when a county or a city decides to use rumble strips where
15 do they get that information?

16 MR. BHULLAR: California MUTCD.

17 MS. MCLAUGHLIN: Well, no. Standard -- the rumble
18 strip and the dimensions of the rumble strip, the bumps, are
19 not --

20 MR. BHULLAR: Okay.

21 MS. MCLAUGHLIN: -- that part of their standard
22 plans.

23 CHAIR FISHER: It's a part of the Caltrans standard
24 plans; right?

25 MS. MCLAUGHLIN: Which -- correct. And a lot of

1 municipalities use that.

2 CHAIR FISHER: Right.

3 MR. BHULLAR: But they're not required to.

4 CHAIR FISHER: Right. Any other discussion on this
5 item? Mike?

6 VICE CHAIR ROBINSON: I've got a question
7 regarding -- this is on Section 3J.01.

8 MS. MCLAUGHLIN: Which page? Which --

9 VICE CHAIR ROBINSON: This is page 196. You have a
10 handwritten note regarding the -- the indication, "And edge
11 line shall not be used in addition to a rumble -- rumble stripe
12 that is located along a shoulder."

13 MS. MCLAUGHLIN: That was --

14 VICE CHAIR ROBINSON: You're saying leave in?

15 MS. MCLAUGHLIN: Yes. So that would not be crossed
16 out.

17 VICE CHAIR ROBINSON: Okay. I'm looking over on --
18 on page 199 now where you are showing in Figure 3J-1 with a
19 note, "Edge line may be located alongside."

20 MS. MCLAUGHLIN: Correct.

21 VICE CHAIR ROBINSON: Am I -- am I -- am I missing
22 something here?

23 MS. MCLAUGHLIN: Well, what the -- what -- the issue
24 there was the -- the difference between an edge line and a
25 rumble stripe. So an edge line shall not be used in addition

1 to a rumble stripe. So the rumble stripe, which is not
2 illustrated -- we're not showing it. I guess the terminology
3 is that they were using the terminology rumble stripe. We
4 don't have a rumble stripe. We have a rumble strip which is
5 the bumps in the -- in the pavement.

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER KELLER: Okay. So then -- so then
7 under --

8 MS. MCLAUGHLIN: So in other words -- in other words
9 what this was -- this is meant to say is that you would not use
10 an edge line in addition to a rumble stripe. So you would have
11 essentially two strips on the roadway.

12 CHAIR FISHER: I'm thoroughly confused. It seems
13 like it would be a lot clearer if the -- the language that you
14 want to retain on page 196 said rumble strip, not rumble
15 stripe.

16 MS. MCLAUGHLIN: That's federal language that is
17 their standard.

18 MR. WONG: (Off mike.) If you look at the screen
19 it's (inaudible) that federal language. So is the figure down
20 below.

21 MS. MCLAUGHLIN: Yeah. And that red crossing was out
22 from our previous meetings. You guys chose to cross that out
23 in red.

24 MR. WONG: So this is -- this figure, particular
25 figure is also a federal figure. So basically, I believe

1 Roberta's proposal is for -- at least for the Part 3 is taking
2 out of the California edition.

3 MS. MCLAUGHLIN: And -- and I think if you go back --
4 back to page 196, the problem is when you -- when you put the
5 edge line on top -- top of the rumble strip it becomes a rumble
6 stripe. So they're saying if you do that you're not to put an
7 additional edge line next to the rumble stripe, which is a
8 bumpy stripe. So in other words, you're trying to eliminate
9 both -- you do not want to have two lines out there on the edge
10 line.

11 CHAIR FISHER: Okay. The time is drawing late. Do
12 we have any final comments on this item?

13 MR. WONG: I have one more comment. This is not only
14 in Part 3. It also exists in Part 6. So Roberta has also
15 proposed to delete the California language, as well as some of
16 the federal language on the -- on Part 6.

17 MS. MCLAUGHLIN: Page 200. Thank you, Gordon.

18 CHAIR FISHER: Okay. Are we in conceptual agreement?

19 VICE CHAIR ROBINSON: No. I'm still -- I'm looking
20 now at -- I'm looking now at Figure 3J-1B.

21 CHAIR FISHER: Page number?

22 VICE CHAIR ROBINSON: Page 199. And you said it
23 becomes a rumble stripe when you put a -- when you paint a
24 rumble strip?

25 MS. MCLAUGHLIN: That's what they're -- the

1 terminology they're using in the text.

2 VICE CHAIR ROBINSON: Okay. Well, B then, "edge line
3 on the rumble strip?"

4 MS. MCLAUGHLIN: That's correct.

5 VICE CHAIR ROBINSON: So then it becomes a rumble
6 stripe?

7 MS. MCLAUGHLIN: But they're not labeling it there on
8 that figure. And, yeah, so there's some confusion. When they
9 combine the two it becomes a rumble stripe if the edge line
10 goes on top of the rumble strip, and that's what they're
11 showing in Part B.

12 In California we don't call it a rumble stripe. We
13 don't have anything that defines a rumble stripe. That's
14 probably why we originally took it out of that language.

15 CHAIR FISHER: Okay. We need to conclude. Do we
16 have general consensus on this item? Any final comments?

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER KELLER: So I guess it was unclear.
18 So we're not referencing the TOPD in here?

19 MS. MCLAUGHLIN: Not for the rumble strip.

20 MR. BHULLAR: No, we're not.

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER KELLER: Okay.

22 CHAIR FISHER: All in favor of the proposed revisions
23 raise your hand. One, two, three, four, five, six -- okay.
24 Okay. Seven for, one against.

25 MR. WONG: Should I include it in Part 6, as well, or

1 does it only apply to Part 3?

2 CHAIR FISHER: We already approved Part 6.

3 MS. MCLAUGHLIN: Yeah. Yes. And including the --

4 CHAIR FISHER: Okay.

5 MS. MCLAUGHLIN: -- yeah, the rumble strip.

6 CHAIR FISHER: Right. Okay.

7 MS. MCLAUGHLIN: Thank you.

8 CHAIR FISHER: Is that it?

9 MS. MCLAUGHLIN: That would be it for me.

10 CHAIR FISHER: I had one question.

11 MR. WONG: I have one small comment on Part 6.

12 CHAIR FISHER: Quickly.

13 MR. WONG: Quickly. That John, well, he proposed to

14 leave in a sentence that rumble strips are not a suitable

15 riding surface for bicycles.

16 MS. MCLAUGHLIN: Which -- so which line?

17 MR. WONG: The rumble strips in Part 6.

18 MS. MCLAUGHLIN: In Part 6?

19 MR. WONG: In Part 6.

20 MS. MCLAUGHLIN: Can you show us on the screen?

21 MR. WONG: I don't know which page. It's -- for Part

22 6 I suggest to leave it to CTCDC agenda items to -- for further

23 discussion because there's other changes needed. And Roberta's

24 suggestion does delete federal language that I don't

25 particularly agree with.

1 MR. BHULLAR: That's fine. We can include in your
2 other item, as well.

3 MR. WONG: Yeah. I'd prefer to discuss the
4 particulars in a CTCDC agenda item.

5 MS. MCLAUGHLIN: Okay.

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: Plus the CBAC would like to
7 talk with her, so --

8 MS. MCLAUGHLIN: Very good.

9 CHAIR FISHER: I had one question before we conclude.
10 In the pavement markings for HOV lanes --

11 MS. MCLAUGHLIN: Yes.

12 CHAIR FISHER: -- I thought you came up with some
13 good drawings. Are those definitely going to be shown in Part
14 3A that shows --

15 MS. MCLAUGHLIN: Yes.

16 CHAIR FISHER: -- that this is a line and the spacing
17 between them?

18 MS. MCLAUGHLIN: Yes.

19 CHAIR FISHER: Okay.

20 MS. MCLAUGHLIN: And we have a draft. It's not ready
21 for publication. It's adding a series of details for that HOV
22 striping.

23 CHAIR FISHER: Okay. Great.

24 MS. MCLAUGHLIN: Thank you.

25 MR. BHULLAR: All right. With keeping the clock in

1 mind, I'm going to just call on a couple of things.

2 Ahmad, do you have anything that you feel you need
3 the committee's recommendation, or are we clear on those?

4 MR. RASTEGARPOUR: No.

5 MR. BHULLAR: Okay. Don, are you -- do you need
6 committee's input on two items, either CMS, the changeable
7 message sign comment, or the other one is the pictograph?

8 MR. HOWE: No.

9 MR. BHULLAR: Okay. And then the others, I think we
10 have it addressed.

11 So with that in mind I think the rest of the
12 comments, if most of them are easily -- they can be addressed.
13 And we will be putting notations in the next couple of weeks or
14 so online. So with that have we addressed at least the
15 committee's concerns regarding the California MUTCD final draft
16 before we proceed further with finalizing the initial date?

17 CHAIR FISHER: I think let the record show that we've
18 put in a lot of time to try to make this a usable document and
19 to reflect the comments that we received.

20 MR. BHULLAR: But we do need a final --

21 SECRETARY SINGH: So who want to move motion?

22 CHAIR FISHER: Huh?

23 SECRETARY SINGH: Who want to move motion?

24 CHAIR FISHER: Oh. Yeah. Let's have a motion to
25 adopt the 2011 California MUTCD as we discussed today?

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: I'll make that motion.

2 VICE CHAIR ROBINSON: I'll second.

3 CHAIR FISHER: Okay. Moved by Wayne. Seconded by
4 Mike.

5 MR. BHULLAR: Just a minor point in that I think the
6 motion is worded as 2011. I wanted to see what the committee
7 thinks, because we have until January 15th, 2012, and if the
8 two proposed revisions to the federal manual, they come in very
9 late, do we want to call it the 2012 and issue it in the first
10 week of January --

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: I think --

12 MR. BHULLAR: -- or will the committee be opposed to
13 it if we did that?

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: That's the question.
15 Also, I said I'm going to bring it up. I'm -- I'm glad you
16 brought it up.

17 MR. BHULLAR: Because --

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: I think 2012 is better.
19 Let's --

20 CHAIR FISHER: I think it is too. I think it would
21 be kind of cheating to maybe adopt it on the 28th of December
22 and call it the 2011. We know it's going to be adopted close
23 to January 1st, so let's just call it the 2012.

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Mr. Chairman?

25 CHAIR FISHER: Yes, Hamid?

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Not to take away from the
2 great work that all the other staff has done, I think we need
3 to acknowledge for the record the great job that Johnny has
4 done again this round -- this last round. Thank you.

5 MR. BHULLAR: Outstanding. As well as that of the
6 Caltrans' staff that has assisted him. Thank you all for that.
7 Okay.

8 Let's go to the setting the --

9 SECRETARY SINGH: Next meeting.

10 CHAIR FISHER: -- on the -- for the CTCDC. I guess
11 that meeting should be in Southern California, and it probably
12 should be in early February.

13 SECRETARY SINGH: I think that's probably right.

14 CHAIR FISHER: So do we have a tentative date we want
15 to set?

16 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: We haven't been to San
17 Diego in a long time.

18 VICE CHAIR ROBINSON: John, was the -- was the
19 clapping, was that the -- the vote on the approval of the
20 MUTCD?

21 SECRETARY SINGH: We didn't -- we didn't have our
22 vote. We just left. There's a motion but there's no vote.

23 CHAIR FISHER: Well, I thought we were clapping to
24 recognize Johnny.

25 MS. MCLAUGHLIN: That was Johnny's --

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: Well, yeah, we haven't
2 voted on the --

3 MR. BHULLAR: Yeah. We need to vote on the --

4 CHAIR FISHER: Oh, we didn't vote on it?

5 MR. BHULLAR: No.

6 CHAIR FISHER: Okay. All those in favor of the
7 adoption as discussed today, raise your hands. Okay. It's
8 unanimous. Thank you.

9 SECRETARY SINGH: Michael has fulfilled his co-chair
10 responsibilities.

11 CHAIR FISHER: Okay.

12 VICE CHAIR ROBINSON: For the year.

13 CHAIR FISHER: So let's set the next meeting for
14 early February in Southern California. Do we have a tentative
15 date, Devinder?

16 SECRETARY SINGH: The 9th or 16th. The 9th or 16th.

17 MS. MCLAUGHLIN: There's a three-day weekend in there
18 somewhere.

19 CHAIR FISHER: Oh. So is the 9th not a three-day
20 weekend?

21 MS. MCLAUGHLIN: Well, I'm not sure which. You have
22 President's Day.

23 SECRETARY SINGH: Well, then let's do the 16th then.

24 CHAIR FISHER: So Thursday, February 16th. Why don't
25 we tentatively plan to have it in San Diego County.

1 And, Mike, can you work with Devinder to identify a
2 suitable location?

3 VICE CHAIR ROBINSON: Sure will. Be my pleasure.

4 CHAIR FISHER: Great. Great. Okay. Well, with that
5 we'll adjourn the meeting.

6 (Thereupon the California Traffic Control Devices Committee

7 Adjourned at 4:49 p.m.)

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

TRANSCRIBER'S CERTIFICATE

I, Martha L. Nelson, attest that the foregoing proceedings were transcribed to the best of my ability.

I further certify that I am not a relative or employee of any attorney of the parties, nor financially interested in the action.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

Dated this 6th day of November, 2011.

 /s/ Martha L. Nelson